

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

DANIEL AND HIS PROPHECIES

DANIEL AND HIS PROPHECIES

BY THE

REV. CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D.

Trin. Coll., Dub. ; M.A., Exeter Coll., Oxon ; Ph.D. of the University of Leipzig ;
Donnellan Lecturer in the University of Dublin (1880-1) ;
Bampton Lecturer (1878) ; Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint (1893-7) ; and
Public Examiner in Semitic Languages in the Honours School,
University of Oxford (1894, 1895)

LONDON

WILLIAMS AND NORGATE

14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN

1906

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	vii
THE BOOK OF DANIEL (a New Translation based on the Revised Version)	I
<small>CHAP.</small>	
1. THE BOOK OF DANIEL IN GENERAL	43
2. THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL, AND THE LATER WORKS REFERRING TO THE BOOK IN PRE-CHRISTIAN AND APOSTOLIC TIMES—	
§ 1. The Septuagint Version	58
§ 2. The First Book of Maccabees	63
§ 3. The Third Book of the Sibyllines	68
§ 4. The Book of Ben Sira	75
§ 5. The Book of Enoch — The Enoch Literature	79
§ 6. Allusions in Judith and Tobit	85
§ 7. The Book of Baruch — The Baruch Literature	85
§ 8. Josephus	88
§ 9. The Psalter of Solomon and the Assump- tion of Moses	90
§ 10. The Book of 4 Esdras	91
§ 11. The Book of Jubilees	92
§ 12. The New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers	97

CHAP.		PAGE
3.	THE HISTORICAL NARRATIVES OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL—	
	§ 1. The opening chapter of Daniel, and Nebuchadnezzar's campaigns against Judah (Dan. i.)	101
	§ 2. The Narrative of the Fiery Furnace (Dan. iii.)	113
	§ 3. The Madness of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. iv.)	118
4.	THE HISTORICAL NARRATIVES OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL (<i>continued</i>)—	
	§ 1. Belshazzar's feast and Babylon's overthrow (Dan. v.)	122
	§ 2. Darius the Mede, and Daniel in the lions' den (Dan. vi.)	134
5.	THE PROPHECIES OF THE FOUR KINGDOMS (Dan. ii. and vii.)	142
6.	THE PROPHECY ABOUT MEDIA, PERSIA, AND GREECE (Dan. viii.)	171
7.	THE PROPHECY OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS (Dan. ix. 24-27)	191
8.	THE LAST VISION OF DANIEL (Dan. xi. 1-19)	242
	Persia and Greece	244
	Wars between Syria and Egypt	250
	Antiochus the Great and his Overthrow	259
	Seleucus IV.	273
9.	THE LAST VISION OF DANIEL — <i>continued</i> (Dan. xi. 20-40)—	
	Antiochus Epiphanes and his Career	276
10.	THE LAST VISION (<i>continued</i>)—(Dan. xi. 40-xii.)—	
	Contest and Final Victory	310
	GENERAL INDEX	327
	INDEX OF TEXTS SPECIALLY ILLUSTRATED	334

INTRODUCTION

IN discussing the numerous questions connected with the Book of Daniel, whether with reference to its historical narratives or its prophecies, every commentator must start from some fixed standpoint, whether it be explicitly stated or tacitly assumed. The majority of the critics of the modern school believe that everything which properly falls under the designation of the "supernatural" ought to be regarded as fabulous. The adoption of such a principle compels those who accept it to regard the Book of Daniel as a whole as utterly unworthy of credence. For that book presupposes the miraculous in both its narratives and prophecies. If a belief in the supernatural be once abandoned, the book (notwithstanding its recognition by our Lord and His Apostles) will lose all its value and authority.

A professedly Christian commentator ought to follow the teaching of Christ. The books of the Old Testament, viewed from a Christian standpoint, derive their authority from the recognition accorded to them by our Lord and the Apostles. The historical parts of the Old Testament endorsed in the New Testament writings ought to be accepted by Christians as true.

Upon questions of the interpretation of the Scriptures there is, however, a wide scope for difference of opinion.

The truths of revelation were not communicated all at once, but gradually revealed at considerable intervals of time. This statement is in accordance with the teaching of the Old Testament Scriptures themselves, and is also borne witness to by our Lord. Such a gradual unfolding of truth is tersely set forth in the expression employed in Heb. i. 1, namely, "by divers portions and by divers manners."

The New Testament, however, nowhere affirms that the text of the Old Testament books has been preserved intact. Christ and the Apostles, however, appealed to the Old Testament Scriptures in the form in which they were handed down by the Jewish Synagogue and in the Septuagint version; and however imperfect the received text may be in many passages, it contains for all practical purposes the truths revealed by God to His ancient people.

In the critical study of the books of the Old Testament hypotheses cannot be dispensed with. Investigations in all departments of human knowledge have been benefited by such. But persons who accept the teachings of the Divine Master ought to oppose all hypotheses which affirm that Christ was ignorant of the history of the past, or of the future which He revealed. We cannot admit that Christ when on earth was subject to the prejudices of the age in which He lived, and of the nation from which He sprang. On the Easter Day on which the Lord Jesus rose from the dead He affirmed on two different occasions the truth of the prophecies He had previously explained to the disciples. He then twice pointed out to them that the Messianic prophecies contained in the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms (Luke xxiv. 44) testified of Himself. It is the

duty of a critic to investigate all objections which can be adduced against the truthfulness of any special book. He ought to recognise the points on which no definite conclusion can be fairly arrived at, and to accept any light which may be thrown on divers matters of detail by critics of all phases of thought.

It is unwise, in the present state of information, to rest the defence of the Book of Daniel upon the historical narratives therein recorded. The assailants of the book have indeed made use of all the arguments which scholarship and ingenuity could adduce in order to discredit the trustworthiness of those historical narratives. On the other hand, its defenders have often shown themselves too ready to snatch at every floating straw which appeared to lend support to cherished convictions. This has been in a marked manner the case in the numerous attempts made to utilise, without sufficient examination, the statements in Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions.

But neither assailants nor defenders have succeeded in fully proving their respective cases. The historical statements of the Book of Daniel have not been proved untrue. Some of those histories, indeed, are not free from difficulties, which cannot be removed until light has been shed upon the matter by the discovery of further inscription. Yet the most judicious of English critics of the modern school has been constrained to admit, in reference to the first historical difficulty presented in this book, that the capture of Jerusalem related in Dan. i. "cannot strictly speaking be disproved," although it may be "highly improbable" (*Driver*).

It is too early to sing songs of triumph while the battle is going on. Hence it is injudicious to follow

the line of argument taken up in England by Pusey, or by such later writers as Rev. J. Urquhart and Sir R. Anderson.

The late Professor Dr Aug. Köhler (no contemptible scholar of the conservative school), in his *Lehrbuch der bibl. Gesch.*, rightly maintains that the fact of three or four Greek names of musical instruments occurring in the Book of Daniel is no proof of the late date of that work. It is quite possible that Greek instruments may have been brought to the East even in the times of the Assyrian monarchs, and therefore the Greek names of such instruments naturally passed into the common language of later days. We attach little importance to many of the linguistic difficulties, for reasons which will presently be stated. It is, however, worth while noting what Rawlinson has stated on that head in his *Ancient Monarchies* (vol. i. pp. 528 ff., 540 ff., and iii. 19 ff.).

Köhler notices also that the presence of Persian loan-words affords no certain proof of the date of the composition of the Book of Daniel, when one bears in mind the peculiar relations in which Middle Mesopotamia stood to the Medes in Assyrian times.

No Babylonian inscription has yet been unearthed in which the insanity of Nebuchadnezzar is mentioned. But the later legends derived from Babylonian sources seem to point to some such event as having happened at the end of that monarch's reign. The existence of those legends which are quoted in the body of this work ought to be sufficient to make critics pause before they hastily condemn the account given in Daniel as unhistorical.

It may be admitted that the defenders of the book have not yet been able to clear up the difficulties connected

with the account of "Darius the Mede." But on the other hand the assailants have not themselves been able to suggest any solution of that difficulty which can lay claim on their side to be regarded as an "ascertained result" of modern criticism. It appears to be perfectly certain that "Darius the Mede" is represented by Daniel as a vassal-king of Cyrus.

The attempt to make out that the independent Median empire, which existed prior to the united empire of the Medes and Persians, was that spoken of by Daniel in ch. ii. and ch. vii. as the second great kingdom rests on no solid basis. Neither in the first portion of the book (ch. i.-vii.) nor in the second part (ch. vii.-xii.) is there any reference whatever made to that kingdom. It was a kingdom with which the Jewish nation never came into contact.

The composition of the Book of Daniel in two languages, Hebrew and Aramaic, has been, perhaps, sufficiently dealt with in the opening chapter of the work.

It may be well to note that Sir Isaac Newton, in his suggestive *Observations on Daniel and the Apocalypse*, p. 10 (published 1733), maintained that the first six chapters of Daniel were a collection of historical papers written by different writers, and that the second portion only (ch. vii.-xii.) was written by Daniel. Sir I. Newton lays stress upon the fact that Daniel is always spoken of in the third person in the first part, while the first person is employed in the later chapters. It is quite possible to believe that the whole book was supervised by Daniel, and even to maintain that the writer of the first part was his scribe. Hence even on Newton's hypothesis the book would be substantially the work of Daniel. Both parts of the book mutually depend on one another. The essential unity of the book is unaffected by that or any similar

hypothesis, such as, that it may be regarded as a book composed of extracts from one of larger dimensions.

Inasmuch as the critical examination of the historical portion cannot in the present state of our information be conclusively relied on in any defence of the Book of Daniel, it is advisable to lay more stress upon its prophetic portion. That portion is, from a Christian standpoint, of greater importance than the historical.

In discussing ch. vii.—xii. one must strongly repudiate the "methods" which have been adopted by critics in order completely to destroy its importance.

If it were admitted that the Roman empire is the fourth kingdom depicted in ch. ii. and vii., the conclusion must follow that the writer of the Book of Daniel was supernaturally gifted with prophetic insight into the future. Unbelieving critics have, therefore, from the time of Porphyry downwards, been compelled to suggest some other solution of the enigma. Those four kingdoms were expounded by eminent Jewish interpreters to be the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Grecian, and Roman, in ages before Christ came into the world, and long after that event. The same explanation is followed by Christ, and by the great majority of the Christian expositors for nearly two millenniums.

It was formerly fashionable in critical circles to expound the fourth kingdom to be the empire ruled over by the Diadochoi, or the Successors of Alexander. That solution is now generally abandoned, although still defended by Dean Farrar and Meinhold. The attempt to intercalate the Median empire as the second kingdom has been adopted by the majority of modern scholars in order to render it possible to maintain the Book of Daniel to be the production of Maccabean times.

In order to break down one of the principal arguments of those who maintain that the Book of Daniel was written in the Maccabean period, it is important to note the arguments which tend to prove that the "little horn" of ch. vii. is radically distinct from that described in ch. viii. as a "very little horn." The arguments on this head are sufficiently set forth in the present volume. They are defended in more detail in the *Critical and Grammatical Commentary*.

The attempt of modern critics to destroy the Messianic interpretation of the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks is, in our opinion, one of the most remarkable instances of a determination to refuse to consider simple facts. The difficulties connected with the Messianic interpretation are comparatively small, and do not affect the prophecy in its most important outlines. The Messianic interpretation reaches back to a period before Christ, and has (with trifling exceptions) been maintained by the Church Fathers, and by Christian expositors down to the rise of the modern school of exegesis. The passage as it stands in the traditional text cannot as a whole be referred to the Maccabean period. The total eradication of most important clauses and the dislocation of others, in the prophecy in the Septuagint translation, go far to prove that its application to the Maccabean age cannot be supported, if the Hebrew text be adhered to. Hence the later representatives of the Rationalistic school have proposed a number of radical transformations of the whole passage. Professor Bevan has been obliged honestly to confess, after all those modifications have been duly considered, that no intelligible sense can be extracted from the latter two verses of the prophecy, although the prophecy itself consists only of four verses. What-

ever may be said of traces of the Maccabean period existing in other parts of the book, the prophecy of "the Seventy Weeks" certainly does not belong to that period. The weak Onias III. was not "the anointed one," or the Messiah, referred to in that great prediction, although that Rationalistic interpretation is distinctly set forth in the Revised English Version.

The Futuristic school of prophetic interpretation has been to no small degree responsible for the success which has attended the modern onslaught on the credibility of the prophecies of the Old and New Testament Scriptures. The interpreters of that narrow school of thought, however, imagine themselves to be the only real defenders of Holy Scripture. The origin of that school in its modern phase may be traced back to Ribera, a distinguished Jesuit expositor (1585), and to the other remarkable Jesuit interpreters of the seventeenth century.

When the Tractarians began their work in the Church of England under the leadership of Newman, Pusey, and their confederates, they soon discovered that it was absolutely necessary for the spread of their opinions that a blow should be struck at the old so-called "Protestant" interpretation of prophecy, which was then almost universally accepted as correct. Newman, as he states in his *Apologia pro vita sua*, was long kept back from imbibing peculiar Romish views by the notion which had been instilled into him in early days that the Pope was the Antichrist. When that opinion was once demolished to his satisfaction, he proceeded comfortably on the way towards Rome.

Futuristic views of prophecy, as was natural, were soon accepted by the theologians of the High Church school, and were also caught up by many popular preachers of the

Evangelical party in the National Church. Among its leaders, at, or shortly after, that period, were the learned Dr S. Roffey Maitland (died 1866), Dr J. Henthorn Todd, Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin (died 1869), with his friend Rev. W. de Burgh, Dr Pusey of Oxford, and many others. The interest, however, in prophetic studies did not long continue to be a general characteristic of the High Church party, but their prophetic views spread among writers of the so-called "Plymouth Brethren."¹ J. N. Darby may be fairly called the leader of that peculiar movement, although not, perhaps, the earliest exponent of its principles. He for a season fascinated even Francis William Newman, the brother of the late "Cardinal," who continued for some time his devoted follower. Darby himself wrote on the Apocalypse. Most of their leaders wrote on prophecy, and all more or less in support of Futuristic views. Among the more notable were Dr S. P. Tregelles (whose Old Testament scholarship was not equal to that he displayed in New Testament criticism), W. Kelly, of whom the same remark may be made, B. W. Newton, and a host of minor writers.

A craving after sensationalism is a marked characteristic of many of the writers of the Futurist school. The Book of Daniel itself ought to have acted as a warning against their fantastic views of the imaginary Antichrist of the latter days. For Antiochus Epiphanes and his fellows, though spoken of as "contemptible," and described as a "very little horn" in ch. viii., which was seen in the vision of the prophet to shoot up as high as

¹ The work of Mr William Blair Neatly, M.A., *The History of the Plymouth Brethren*, gives a fair description of that curious movement (1902).

the stars, and to cast down some of the stars, and to exalt himself "even to the Prince of the host." The "very little horn," which is in some respects more remarkable than "the little horn" of ch. vii., is incorrectly identified with the so-called "wilful king" of ch. xi., an expression used in that chapter also of Alexander the Great and Antiochus the Great (see note on p. 298). The comparison between ch. vii. and viii. will show something of Futuristic exaggerations. Our Lord describes Himself as coming unexpectedly in the clouds of heaven to an apathetic and pleasure-loving world (Matt. xxiv. 37 ff.). These novel Futurists expound the prophecies as teaching that the disconnected ten kingdoms will all be joined again together (contrary to the statement of Dan. ii. 43, 44), and Satan visibly seated on the throne of a united world, when the Son of Man shall appear. All these are idle dreams of men imperfectly acquainted with the prophecies.

The great Joseph Mede long ago remarked that "the Jews expected Christ to come when He did come, and yet knew Him not when He was come, because they fancied the manner and quality of His coming like some temporal monarch with armed power to subdue the earth before Him. So the Christians, God's second Israel, looked [expected that] the coming of Antichrist should be at that time when he came indeed, and yet they knew him not when he was come; because they had fancied his coming as of some barbarous Tyrant who should with armed power not only persecute and destroy the Church of Christ, but almost the world; that is, they looked for such an Antichrist as the Jews looked for a Christ" (*Mede's Works*, p. 647).

"The Antichrist" and "the deceiver" has been working

in the Church since St John's days (2 John 7). The outward and visible Church very soon began to wrap earth-woven robes around her, and to dream of "infallibility," all the while that she abounded with false doctrines, and had departed widely from "the faith once for all delivered to the saints." Outside the Church there is no Antichrist, in the Biblical sense of the term ; inside the Church that evil power has sat for nearly two thousand years as "God in the temple of God."

The attempt to interpret Old and New Testament prophecies literally, as these writers term it, led the Futurists into conclusions which, as Professor Birks of Cambridge long ago stated, tended to undermine the foundations of all Christian Evidences. That learned writer noted that their reasonings and principles were more incredulous than those of the infidel, and asserted that, when such opinions gained general currency and approval in the Church, the reign of open infidelity would be at hand. This statement was made about 1841, in his book on the *First Elements of Sacred Prophecy*.

Similar warnings to that effect were uttered by other writers. The warnings have passed by unheeded. What was foreseen has long since come to pass. Both in England and Germany the old interpretation of Daniel and the Apocalypse has been too often cast aside, as worthy at best only of the study of antiquarians, and the disparagement of the prophecies of Scripture as truly "inspired" has grown apace. The old writers on prophecy were, no doubt, not free from their share of blame ; for, while they upheld the main truth, they often put forth expositions on many points which could not stand investigation.

The Protestant interpreters too often trod unad-

visedly in the steps of those who went before them, and tried to adapt the statements in the prophecies to the events of their own day. A similar tendency characterised the work of the old Greek translators popularly known as the LXX. That tendency to a large extent marred the *Horæ Apocalypticæ* of the Rev. E. B. Elliott, which, with all its shortcomings, displays almost on every page marks of genuine scholarship. The Appendix at the end of Mr Elliott's fourth volume on the *History of Apocalyptic Interpretation* from the earliest ages is characterised by deep research.

The present work does not treat of the Apocalypse of St John. But writers on that New Testament book generally seek at the same time to interpret the Book of Daniel. Our contention is that every book of prophecy, especially of the Old Testament, ought, in the first case at least, to be examined by itself, independently of any other.

The Book of Zechariah has, however, a direct connection with that of Daniel. Hence we do not agree with Prof. König, who maintains that Daniel's four kingdoms could not be referred to in the visions of Zechariah, because the latter prophet refers only to events past or present in his day. The four war-chariots of Zechariah are represented not as contemporaneous, but as going forth one after the other to execute the wrath of God in various parts of the earth. The first of those chariots, when it caught the prophet's eyes, seems to have almost passed out of sight. It had in its rapid career passed by, and its avenging work was done. But the fourth chariot was not then ready for the work to be assigned to it. In the use of the symbol "horns," and of the number "four," the visions of Zechariah appear to some extent based on the Book of Daniel. But the fourth monarchy

of Daniel is not included in the number of Zechariah's "four horns." For in Zechariah's vision the horns, which belonged to some animal dimly seen in a mist, were succeeded by "smiths," who came to "fray" the animals by sawing off the top of their horns. The last of those "smiths" appears to represent Alexander the Great, who destroyed the might of Medo-Persia. The fourth kingdom of Daniel, however, was to perish by the might of no mere earthly conqueror, but by the great Messiah's appearance on the field of battle.

König, in his *Einleitung*, seems also mistaken in supposing that all the work predicted by the prophets of the Restoration was to take place within "a little while," and that therefore the distant future of Daniel's four kingdoms could not be referred to. The interpretation of the passage of Haggai in Heb. xii. 26-28 teaches a very different lesson.

We must refer the reader to the last chapters of the work for our theory of how best the difficulties of ch. xi. can be explained. It must not be forgotten that in the Maccabean period there was a wholesale destruction of the sacred books of the Jews. The adversaries of the Jewish faith were well aware, from the renegade Jews in their midst, of the existence of the oracles of Daniel, as well as of the influence that book had with the Jewish people. In re-editing at that period the Book of Daniel, it may have been a matter of importance that its language should to some extent approximate to that of the common people. Hence harmless alterations as to language may have been then introduced. It is generally believed that the Synagogue at, or shortly after, that period discountenanced the reading of all books save "inspired" works. Hence it is easy to account for the non-existence

of Jewish histories of that period which could cast light upon questions connected with the settlement of the canon. The history of 1 Maccabees, although composed in Hebrew or Aramaic, has only come down to us in a Greek translation executed in Egypt. That book seems to have been almost lost in Palestine at an early period. The second Book of Maccabees was compiled in Egypt from the writings of Jason of Cyrene. Hence the linguistic phenomena which mark the Book of Daniel may be partially due to the confusions of the Maccabean period. They are insufficient to prove the composition of that book at so late a period. It is not impossible that the book passed through a variety of vicissitudes. Composed in all probability originally in Hebrew, it seems to have been soon translated for popular reading into Aramaic. Then, the Hebrew original having been partially lost or destroyed, the book was again translated into Hebrew from the Aramaic, and the portions which were wanting made up from the Aramaic. Of course these points cannot be proved by any distinct evidence, but similar facts have occurred in the transmission of several apocryphal writings, as, for instance, 1 Maccabees and the Book of Enoch.

In our *Critical and Grammatical Commentary* the information generally given under the heading of *Apparatus Criticus* will be duly supplied. For the present, it may suffice here to note two popular works, one English and the other German, which contain much matter in defence of the book in general, though their statements on the question of the Babylonian inscriptions must be taken *cum grano salis*. One cannot also defend their representation of opponents. The English work is that of the Rev. John Urquhart, *The Inspiration and Accuracy of the Holy*

Scriptures (London: Marshall Bros., Keswick House, Paternoster Row. The Preface is dated April 1905). Mr Urquhart gives on the whole a fair review of the history of Rationalism, but it is incorrect in some particulars. Rationalism was as much an English as a German product. The English deists roused up Voltaire, and through Voltaire French influence affected Germany, where it soon assumed peculiar forms. Mr Urquhart does not seem to comprehend the strength of the objections on the other side, which are not so easily demolished as he imagines.

The German work is *Der Pseudodaniel u. Pseudojesaja des modernen Kriitik*, von Eduard Rupprecht (Erlangen and Leipzig, 1894). This treatise is written in a trenchant style, and contains material of considerable importance, though it seems to have been looked down upon by German critics as beneath notice. It is not, however, only critics, but the whole body of "Christ's faithful people," who have to pass a judgment on such questions. Rupprecht's brochure is far from contemptible, although we cannot endorse some of its arguments. But still less can we endorse the arguments of the so-called critics.

Professor Kautzsch, in the *Abriss der Geschichte des alt-test. Schrifttums*, appended to his *Die heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments übersetzt*, makes the following sweeping remark on the Book of Daniel as a whole: "All difficulties vanish with one stroke, if one acknowledges the book, as it is in truth, as a writing of encouragement and warning dating from the time of the severe persecution of the Jews under Antiochus Epiphanes IV."

This statement is quite incapable of proof. It is opposed to the fact that serious changes have to be made in the text of the prophecy of "the Seventy Weeks" to impart

to it a Maccabean appearance. The identification of the two horns spoken of in ch. vii. and ch. viii. is utterly opposed to the descriptions given of them by the prophet. The fourth kingdom cannot be proved to be the Grecian. Even on our hypothesis, namely, that ch. xi. is partially a Targum, there are several passages of that chapter which cannot be interpreted of the Maccabean era. Instead of the modern interpretation causing "all difficulties to vanish with one stroke," far greater difficulties are created by it than beset any of the ancient interpretations. See our chapter on the Seventy Weeks. The modern attempt to solve the difficulties of the book on the Maccabean hypothesis has, we maintain, resulted in failure.

In conclusion, I have to thank my friend, the Rev. Professor Margoliouth, D.Litt., of Oxford, for kindly reading through the greater portion of this work in typed form ; and also Dr Theophilus G. Pinches, the distinguished Assyrian scholar who is now Lecturer on Assyriology in University College, London, and who has afforded me much help in matters connected with his department. Those scholars are, however, not responsible for my views.

CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT.

90 BOLINGBROKE GROVE,
LONDON, S.W.,
28th November 1905.

The Book of Daniel

A New Translation based on the Revised
Version

CHAPTER I [*Hebrew*]

IN the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king ¹ of Judah came Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon unto Jerusalem, and besieged it. And the Lord gave ² Jehoiakim king of Judah into his hand, with part of the vessels of the house of God : and he carried them into the land of Shinar to the house of his god : and he brought the vessels into the treasure house of his gods. And the king commanded Ashpenaz the master of his ³ eunuchs to bring in certain of the children of Israel, even of the seed royal and of the nobles ; youths in whom ⁴ was no blemish, but well favoured, and skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability to stand in the king's palace ; and that he should teach them books and the language of the Chaldeans. And the king appointed ⁵ for them a portion assigned for every day of the king's dainties, and of the wine which he drank, and that they

should be nourished three years ; that at the end of them they might stand before the king.

6 Now among these were, of the children of Judah,
7 Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah. And the prince of the eunuchs gave names unto them : unto Daniel he gave the name of Belteshazzar ; and to Hananiah, of Shadrach ; and to Mishael, of Meshach ; and to Azariah, of Abed-nego.

8 But Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the king's dainties, nor with the wine which he drank : therefore he requested of the prince of
9 the eunuchs that he might not defile himself. Now God made Daniel to find favour and compassion in the sight
10 of the prince of the eunuchs. And the prince of the eunuchs said unto Daniel, I fear my lord the king, who hath appointed your food and your drink : for why should he see your faces worse liking than the youths which are of your own age ? then ye would endanger
11 my head with the king. Then said Daniel to the guardian, whom the prince of the eunuchs had appointed
12 over Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah : Test thy servants, I beseech thee, ten days ; and let them give
13 us vegetables to eat, and water to drink. Then let our countenances be looked upon before thee, and the countenance of the youths that eat of the king's dainties ;
14 and as thou seest, deal with thy servants. So he hearkened unto them in this matter, and tested them ten
15 days. And at the end of ten days their countenances appeared fairer, and they were fatter in flesh, than all the
16 king's youths which did eat of the king's dainties. So the guardian used to take away their dainties, and the wine that they should drink, and gave them vegetables.
17 Now as for these four youths, God gave them

knowledge and skill in all kinds of books and wisdom :
 and Daniel had understanding in all kinds of visions
 and dreams. And at the end of the days which the 18
 king had appointed for bringing them in, the prince of
 the eunuchs brought them in before Nebuchadnezzar.
 And the king communed with them ; and among 19
 them all was found none like Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael,
 and Azariah : so they stood before the king. And 20
 in every matter of wisdom and understanding, concerning
 which the king inquired of them, he found them ten
 times better than all the scribes and magicians that were
 in all his realm. And Daniel continued even unto the 21
 first year of king Cyrus.

CHAPTER II [*Hebrew*]

And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchad- 1
 nezzar Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams ; and his spirit
 was troubled, and his sleep brake from him. Then 2
 the king commanded to call the scribes, and the
 magicians, and the enchanters, and the Chaldeans, for to
 tell the king his dreams. So they came in and stood
 before the king ; and the king said unto them, I have 3
 dreamed a dream, and my spirit is troubled to know the
 dream. Then spake the Chaldeans to the king, 4

—*In Aramaic*—

O king ! Live for ever ! Tell thy servants the dream,
 and we will shew the interpretation. The king 5
 answered and said to the Chaldeans, From me firm is
 the word ; if ye make not known unto me the dream
 and the interpretation thereof, ye shall be cut in pieces,
 and your houses shall be made a dunghill. But if ye 6

shew the dream and the interpretation thereof, ye shall receive of me gifts and rewards and great honour : therefore shew me the dream and the interpretation
7 thereof. They answered the second time and said, Let the king tell his servants the dream, and we will
8 shew the interpretation. The king answered and said, I know most certainly that you are buying time,
9 because ye see that the word is firm from me. But if ye make not known unto me the dream, there is but one law for you : for ye have agreed with one another to speak before me lying and corrupt words, until the time be changed : therefore tell me the dream, and I shall know that ye can shew me the interpretation thereof.
10 The Chaldeans answered before the king, and said, There is not a man upon the earth that can shew the king's matter : forasmuch as no king, lord, nor ruler, hath asked a matter
11 like this of any scribe, or magician, or Chaldean. And it is a rare thing that the king requireth, and there is none other that can shew it before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh.
12 For this cause the king was angry and very furious, and commanded to destroy all the wise men of Babylon.
13 So the decree went forth, and the wise men were to be slain ; and they sought Daniel and his companions to
14 be slain. Then Daniel returned answer with counsel and prudence to Arioch the captain of the king's executioners, who was gone forth to slay the wise men of
15 Babylon : he answered and said to Arioch the king's captain, Wherefore is the decree so urgent from the king ?
16 Then Arioch made the thing known to Daniel. And Daniel went in, and desired of the king that he would appoint him a time, and [that] in order that he might tell the king the interpretation.

Then Daniel went to his house, and made the 17 thing known to Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, his companions: that they would desire mercies of the 18 God of heaven concerning this secret; that they should not destroy Daniel and his companions with the rest of the wise men of Babylon. Then was the secret 19 revealed unto Daniel in a vision of the night. Then Daniel blessed the God of heaven. Daniel answered 20 and said, Blessed be the name of God for ever and ever: for wisdom and might belong to him: and 21 he changeth the times and the seasons: he removeth kings, and setteth up kings: he giveth wisdom unto the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding: he revealeth the deep and secret things: he knoweth 22 what is in the darkness, and the light dwelleth with him. I thank thee, and praise thee, O thou God of my 23 fathers, thou hast given me wisdom and might, and hast now made known unto me what we desired of thee: for thou hast let us know the king's matter. Therefore 24 Daniel went in unto Arioch, whom the king had appointed to destroy the wise men of Babylon: he went and thus he said unto him: Destroy not the wise men of Babylon: bring me in before the king, and I will shew unto the king the interpretation.

Then Arioch brought in Daniel before the king in 25 haste, and said thus unto him, I have found a man of the children of the captivity of Judah, that will make known unto the king the interpretation. The king 26 answered and said to Daniel, whose name was Belteshazzar, Art thou able to make known unto me the dream which I have seen, and the interpretation thereof?

Daniel answered before the king, and said, The 27 secret which the king hath demanded can neither wise

men, magicians, scribes, nor astrologers, shew unto the king ; but there is a God in heaven that revealeth
28 secrets, and he hath made known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days. Thy dream and the visions of thy head upon thy bed, are
29 these : As for thee, O king, thy thoughts came into thy mind upon thy bed, what should come to pass hereafter : and he that revealeth secrets hath made known
30 to thee what shall come to pass. But, as for me, this secret is not revealed to me for any wisdom that I have more than any living, but to the intent that the interpretation may be made known to the king, and that
31 thou mayest know the thoughts of thy heart. Thou, O king, sawest, and behold a certain great image. This image, which was mighty, and whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee ; and the aspect thereof was
32 terrible. As for this image, his head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of
33 brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron, and part of clay. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out
34 without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them in pieces.
35 Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken in pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors ; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them ; and the stone that smote the image became a great
36 mountain, and filled the whole earth. This is the dream ; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king.

37 Thou, O king, art king of kings, unto whom the God of heaven hath given the kingdom, the power, and
38 the strength, and the glory ; and wheresoever the

children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee to rule over them all : thou art the head of gold. And after thee shall arise another kingdom ³⁹ inferior to thee ; and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the ⁴⁰ fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron : forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things : and as iron that crusheth all these, shall it break in pieces and crush. And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, ⁴¹ part of potters' clay, and part of iron, it shall be a divided kingdom ; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were ⁴² part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken. And whereas ⁴³ thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men ; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron doth not mingle with clay. And in the days of those kings shall the God of ⁴⁴ heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed, nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people ; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever. Foras- ⁴⁵ much as thou sawest that a stone was cut out from the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold ; a great God hath made known to the king what shall come to to pass hereafter : and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure.

Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face, and ⁴⁶ worshipped Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odours unto him. The ⁴⁷

king answered unto Daniel, and said, Of a truth your God is the God of gods, and Lord of kings, and a revealer of secrets, seeing thou hast been able to reveal
48 this secret. Then the king made Daniel great, and gave him many great gifts, and made him to rule over the whole province of Babylon, and to be chief governor
49 over all the wise men of Babylon. And Daniel requested of the king, and he appointed Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, over the affairs of the province of Babylon : but Daniel was in the gate of the king.

CHAPTER III [*Aramaic*]

1 Nebuchadnezzar the king made an image of gold, whose height was threescore cubits, and the breadth thereof six cubits : he set it up in the plain of Dura, in
2 the province of Babylon. Then Nebuchadnezzar the king sent to gather together the satraps, the deputies, and the governors, the judges, the treasurers, the counsellors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, to come to the dedication of the image which Nebuchad-
3 nezzar the king had set up. Then the satraps, the deputies, and the governors, the judges, the treasurers, the counsellors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, were gathered together unto the dedication of the image that Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up ; and they stood before the image that Nebuchadnezzar had
4 set up. Then the herald cried aloud, To you it is com-
5 manded, O peoples, nations, and languages, that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchad-
6 nezzar the king hath set up : and whoso falleth not

down and worshippeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace. Therefore at that time, when all the peoples heard the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and all kinds of music, all the peoples, the nations, and the languages, fell down and worshipped the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up.

Wherefore at that time certain Chaldeans came near, and brought accusation against the Jews. They answered and said to Nebuchadnezzar the king, O king, live for ever. Thou, O king, hast made a decree, that every man that shall hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer, and all kinds of music, shall fall down and worship the golden image : and whoso falleth not down and worshippeth, shall be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace. There are certain Jews whom thou hast appointed over the affairs of the province of Babylon, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego ; these men, O king, have not regarded thee : they serve not thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up. Then Nebuchadnezzar in his rage and fury commanded to bring Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. Then they brought these men before the king. Nebuchadnezzar answered and said unto them, Is it of purpose, O Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, that ye serve not my god, nor worship the golden image which I have set up ? Now if ye be ready that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the image which I have made, well : but if ye worship not, ye shall be cast the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace ; and who is that god that shall deliver you out of my hands ?

16 Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, answered and
said to the king, O Nebuchadnezzar, we have no need
17 to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God
whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning
fiery furnace ; and he will deliver us out of thine hand,
18 O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king,
that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden
19 image which thou hast set up. Then was Nebuchad-
nezzar full of fury, and the form of his visage was changed
against Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego : therefore he
spake and commanded that they should heat the furnace
20 seven times more than it was wont to be heated. And
he commanded certain mighty men that were in his
army to bind Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, and to
21 cast them into the burning fiery furnace. Then these
men were bound in their hosen, their tunics, and their
mantles, and their other garments, and were cast into the
22 midst of the burning fiery furnace. Therefore because
the king's commandment was urgent, and the furnace
exceeding hot, the flame of the fire slew those men that
23 took up Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. And these
three men, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, fell down
bound into the midst of the burning fiery furnace.

24 Then Nebuchadnezzar the king was astonished,
and rose up in haste : he spake and said unto his
counsellors, Did not we cast three men bound into the
midst of the fire ? They answered and said unto the
25 king, True, O king. He answered and said, Lo,
I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire,
and they have no hurt ; and the aspect of the fourth is
26 like a son of the gods. Then Nebuchadnezzar came
near to the door of the burning fiery furnace : he spake
and said, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, ye servants

of the Most High God, come-forth, and come. Then Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, came-forth out of the midst of the fire. And the satraps, the deputies, 27 and the governors, and the king's counsellors, being gathered together, saw these men, that the fire had no power upon their bodies, nor was the hair of their head singed, neither were their hosen changed, nor had the smell of fire passed on them. Nebuchadnezzar 28 spake and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who hath sent his angel, and delivered his servants that trusted in him, and have changed the king's word, and have yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any god, except their own God. Therefore I make a decree, that every people, 29 nation, and language, which speak anything amiss against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, shall be cut in pieces, and their houses shall be made a dunghill : because there is no other god that is able to deliver after this manner. Then the king promoted Shadrach, Meshach, 30 and Abed-nego, in the province of Babylon.

[NOTE.—The LXX. add in this chapter, between verse 23 and verse 92 (verse 24 in the Hebrew), the following addition, which is found substantially in Theodotion's version, and is translated in the Vulgate. The variants are not numerous or important ; although not a few changes were introduced into the text of the hymn when it was adapted for Church services and worked up into the "*Benedicite.*" The Syriac contains a few variants, which may be found translated in Churton's *Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures.*]

[*Greek*]

After this manner therefore prayed Ananias, Azarias and Misael, and sung praises to the Lord, when the king ordered them to be cast into the furnace. But Azarias having stood up prayed thus, and having opened his mouth he confessed to the Lord with his companions in the midst of the fire of the furnace made exceeding hot by the Chaldeans. And they said :—

Blessed art Thou, Lord, the God of our fathers, and Thy name is worthy to be praised and glorified for ever; for Thou art righteous in all those things Thou hast done unto us; and all Thy works are true, and Thy ways are right, and all Thy judgments true. And judgments of truth hast Thou done in all the things Thou hast brought upon us, and upon Thy holy city Jerusalem, the city of our fathers, because in truth and judgment Thou hast done all these things on account of our sins. For we have sinned in all things, and have committed iniquity, departing from Thee, and have transgressed in all; and the commandments of Thy Law we have not obeyed, nor kept them, nor have we done as Thou hast commanded us, that it might go well with us. And now all things which Thou hast brought upon us and all things that Thou hast done to us, Thou hast done in true judgment. And Thou didst deliver us into the hands of our wicked enemies, and most hateful apostates, and to an unjust king and most evil in all the earth. And now it is not in us to open the mouth, shame and reproach has been done to thy servants, and to those that fear Thee. Do not deliver us up utterly, for Thy name's sake, and do not disannul Thy covenant. And do not remove Thy pity from us, on account of Abraham who was beloved by Thee, and on account of Isaak Thy servant, and Israel Thy holy one; because Thou spakest to them, saying, that Thou wouldest multiply their seed as the stars of heaven in multitude, and as the sand that is on the sea shore. For we, O Master, are become less than all the nations, and we are low this day in all the world because of our sins. And there is not at this time prince, or prophet, or leader, or burnt offering, or sacrifice, or oblation, or incense, or place of sacrificing before Thee, and of finding mercy. But in a contrite heart and in a humble spirit let us be accepted. As the burnt offerings of rams and bulls, and as the ten thousands of fat lambs, so let our sacrifice be before Thee to-day, and be a propitiation before Thee, that there may not be shame to those who have trusted in Thee, and perfect them after Thee. And now we follow Thee with our whole heart, and we fear Thee, and seek Thy face. Put us not to shame; but do with us compassion according to Thy loving kindness, and according to the multitude of Thy mercy; and deliver us according to Thy marvellous judgments, and give glory to Thy name, O Lord. And let all be confounded who have shown evil to Thy servants, and make them ashamed of all their power, and let their strength be broken. Let them know that Thou alone art the Lord God, and glorious over the whole world.

And they who threw them [into the fire] did not cease heating up the furnace. And when they had thrown the three all together into the furnace, and the furnace was ablaze seven times according to its heating; and when they threw them in, those that threw them in were above them, but they set on fire underneath them naphtha and resin and pitch and brushwood. And the flame streamed up above the furnace forty and nine cubits, and it passed through and burnt the Chaldeans whom it found about the furnace. But the Angel of the Lord came down into the furnace together with those who were about Azarias, and smote the flame of the fire from the furnace, and made the middle of the furnace as a moist whistling wind, so that the fire touched them not at all, and neither hurt them nor troubled them. But the three taking up as out of one mouth hymned, and glorified, and blessed, and extolled God in the furnace, saying:—

Blessed art Thou, God of our Fathers
 And to be praised and highly exalted for ever.
 And blessed be the name of Thy glory for ever,
 And praised-above-all and exalted-above-all for all the eternities.
 Blessed art Thou in the temple of Thy holy glory;
 And be highly-hymned and highly-glorified for ever.
 Blessed be thou upon the throne of glory of Thy kingdom;
 And be hymned and highly-glorified for ever.
 Blessed art Thou who seest abysses, sitting upon cherubim,
 And be praised and exalted for ever.
 Blessed art Thou in the expanse of the heaven,
 And be hymned and exalted for ever.
 Praise the Lord, all ye works of the Lord;
 Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
 Praise the Lord, ye angels of the Lord,
 Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
 Praise the Lord, ye heavens;
 Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
 Praise the Lord, ye waters and all that is above the heaven;
 Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
 Praise the Lord, all the powers of the Lord;
 Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
 Praise the Lord, ye stars of the heaven;
 Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
 Praise the Lord, every shower and dew;
 Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.

- Praise the Lord, all ye winds [or, spirits];
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, ye fire and heat;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, ice and cold;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, dew and snow-storms;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, frosts and cold;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, hoar-frosts and snows;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, nights and days;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, light and darkness;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, lightnings and clouds;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, thou earth;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, mountains and hills,
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, all things that grow upon the earth;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, showers and fountains;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, seas and rivers;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, whales and all that move in the waters;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, all the fowls of heaven;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, four-footed things and wild-beasts of the earth;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, sons of men;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, O Israel;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.
- Praise the Lord, ye priests;
Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.

Praise the Lord, ye servants ;

Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.

Praise the Lord, spirits and souls of the righteous ;

Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.

Praise the Lord, ye holy and lowly in heart ;

Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.

Praise the Lord, Ananias, Azarias, Misael ;

Sing-hymns and highly-exalt Him for ever.

Because He has delivered you from Hades, and saved you from the hand of death, and rescued you from the midst of the burning-flame, and ransomed you from the fire.

Give thanks unto the Lord, for He is good,

For His mercy endureth for ever.

Bless Him, all ye that serve the Lord, the God of gods ; hymn ye and give thanks because His mercy is for ever, and unto the eternity of ages.

And it came to pass when the king heard them singing-hymns, and standing up he saw them alive, then Nebuchadnezzar the king wondered, and rose up in haste, and said to his friends, etc.

CHAPTER IV [*Aramaic*]

[Ch. iii. 31 in the Aram.] Nebuchadnezzar the king, 1
unto all the peoples, nations, and languages, that dwell
in all the earth ; peace be multiplied unto you. It hath 2
seemed good unto me to shew the signs and wonders that
the Most High God hath wrought toward me. How 3
great are his signs ! and how mighty are his wonders ! his
kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is
from generation to generation.

I Nebuchadnezzar was at rest in mine house, and 4
flourishing in my palace. I saw a dream which made 5
me afraid ; and the thoughts upon my bed and the visions
of my head troubled me. Therefore made I a decree 6
to bring in all the wise men of Babylon before me,
that they might make known unto me the interpreta-
tion of the dream. Then came in the scribes, the 7

magicians, the Chaldeans, and the astrologers : and I told the dream before them ; but they did not make known
8 unto me the interpretation thereof. But at the last Daniel came in before me, whose name was Belteshazzar, according to the name of my god, and in whom is the spirit of the holy gods : and I told the dream before
9 him, saying, O Belteshazzar, master of the magicians, because I know that the spirit of the holy gods is in thee, and no secret troubleth thee, tell me the visions of my dream that I have seen, and the interpretation thereof.
10 Thus were the visions of my head upon my bed : I saw, and behold a tree in the midst of the earth, and the
11 height thereof was great. The tree grew, and was strong, and the height thereof reached unto heaven, and
12 the sight thereof to the end of all the earth. The leaves thereof were fair, and the fruit thereof much, and in it was nourishment for all : the beasts of the field were sheltering under it, and the fowls of the heaven were dwelling in the branches thereof, and all flesh was being
13 fed from it. I saw in the visions of my head upon my bed, and, behold, a wakeful and an holy one came
14 down from heaven. He cried aloud, and said thus, Hew down the tree, and cut off his branches, shake off his leaves, and scatter his fruit : let the beasts flee away from under it, and the fowls from his branches.
15 Nevertheless leave the stump of his roots in the earth, even with a band of iron and brass, in the tender grass of the field ; and let it be wet with the dew of heaven, and let his portion be with the beasts in the grass of the
16 earth : let his heart be changed from man's, and let a beast's heart be given unto him ; and let seven times
17 pass over him. The sentence is by the decree of wakeful (ones), and the demand by the word of holy

(ones) : to the intent that the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the lowest of men. This dream I king Nebuchadnezzar have 18 seen : and thou, O Belteshazzar, declare the interpretation, forasmuch as all the wise men of my kingdom are not able to make known unto me the interpretation ; but thou art able, for the spirit of the holy gods is in thee.

Then Daniel, whose name was Belteshazzar, was 19 astonied for a while, and his thoughts troubled him. The king answered and said, Belteshazzar, let not the dream, or the interpretation, trouble thee. Belteshazzar answered and said, My lord, the dream be to them that hate thee, and the interpretation thereof to thine adversaries. The tree that thou sawest, which grew, and was strong, 20 whose height reached unto the heaven, and the sight thereof to all the earth ; whose leaves were fair, and 21 the fruit thereof much, and in it was meat for all : under which the beasts of the field dwelt, and upon whose branches the birds of the heaven had their habitation : it is thou, O king, that art grown and become strong : 22 for thy greatness is grown, and reacheth unto heaven, and thy dominion to the end of the earth. And whereas 23 the king saw a wakeful and an holy (one) coming down from heaven, and saying, Hew down the tree, and destroy it ; nevertheless leave the stump of the roots thereof in the earth, even with a band of iron and brass, in the tender grass of the field ; and let it be wet with the dew of heaven, and let his portion be with the beasts of the field, till seven times pass over him ; this is the 24 interpretation, O king, and it is the decree of the Most High which is come upon my lord the king : that 25 thou shalt be driven from men, and thy dwelling shall be

with the beasts of the field, and thou shalt be made to eat grass as oxen, and shalt be wet with the dew of heaven, and seven times shall pass over thee ; till thou know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth
26 it to whomsoever he will. And whereas they commanded to leave the stump its roots which belonged to the tree ; thy kingdom shall be sure unto thee, after that thou shalt
27 have known that the heavens do rule. Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by shewing mercy to the poor ; if there may be a lengthening of thy tranquillity.

28 All this came upon the king Nebuchadnezzar.
29 At the end of twelve months he was walking on the
30 royal palace of Babylon. The king spake and said, Is not this Babylon the great, which I have built for a royal residence, by the might of my power and for the
31 glory of my majesty ? While the word was in the king's mouth, there fell a voice from heaven, saying, O king Nebuchadnezzar, to thee it is spoken : the
32 kingdom is departed from thee. And thou shalt be driven from men, and thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field ; thou shalt be made to eat grass as oxen, and seven times shall pass over thee ; until thou know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men,
33 and giveth it to whomsoever he will. The same hour was the thing fulfilled upon Nebuchadnezzar : and he was driven from men, and did eat grass as oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till his hair was grown like eagles' feathers, and his nails like birds' claws.
34 And at the end of the days I Nebuchadnezzar lifted up mine eyes unto heaven, and mine understanding returned unto me, and I blessed the Most High, and I

praised and honoured him that liveth for ever ; for his dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom from generation to generation : and all the inhabitants 35 of the earth are reputed as nothing : and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth : and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou ? At the same 36 time mine understanding returned unto me ; and for the glory of my kingdom, my majesty and brightness returned unto me ; and my counsellors and my lords sought unto me ; and I was established in my kingdom, and excellent greatness was added unto me. Now 37 I Nebuchadnezzar praise and extol and honour the King of heaven ; for all his works are truth, and his ways judgement : and those that walk in pride he is able to abase.

CHAPTER V [*Aramaic*]

Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand 1 of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand. Belshazzar, whiles he tasted the wine, commanded to 2 bring the golden and silver vessels which Nebuchadnezzar his father had taken out of the temple which was in Jerusalem ; that the king and his lords, his wives and his concubines, might drink therein. Then they brought 3 the golden vessels that were taken out of the temple of the house of God which was at Jerusalem : and the king and his lords, his wives and his concubines drank in them. They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and 4 of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone.

In the same hour came forth the fingers of a man's 5 hand, and wrote over against the lamp upon the plaister of the wall of the king's palace : and the king saw the

6 part of the hand that wrote. Then the king's
countenance was changed in him, and his thoughts
troubled him ; and the joints of his loins were loosed,
7 and his knees smote one against another. The king
cried aloud to bring in the magicians, the Chaldeans, and
the astrologers. The king spake and said to the wise
men of Babylon, Whosoever shall read this writing, and
shew me the interpretation thereof, shall be clothed with
purple, and have a chain of gold about his neck, and shall
be the third ruler in the kingdom.

8 Then came in all the king's wise men : but they
could not read the writing, nor make known to the king
9 the interpretation. Then was king Belshazzar greatly
troubled, and his countenance was changed in him, and
10 his lords were perplexed. Now the queen by reason
of the words of the king and his lords came into the
banquet house : the queen spake and said, O king, live
for ever ; let not thy thoughts trouble thee, nor let thy
11 countenance be changed : there is a man in thy king-
dom in whom is the spirit of the holy gods ; and in
the days of thy father light and understanding, even
wisdom, like the wisdom of the gods, was found in him :
and the king Nebuchadnezzar thy father, the king, I
say, thy father, made him master of scribes, magicians,
12 Chaldeans, and astrologers ; forasmuch as an excellent
spirit and knowledge, and understanding, interpreting of
dreams, and shewing of dark sentences, and loosing of
knots, were found in the same Daniel, whom the king
named Belteshazzar. Now let Daniel be called, and he
will shew the interpretation.

13 Then was Daniel brought in before the king.
The king spake and said unto Daniel, Art thou Daniel
wno art of the children of the captivity of Judah, whom

the king my father brought out of Judah? I have¹⁴ heard of thee, that the spirit of the gods is in thee, and that light and understanding, even excellent wisdom is found in thee. And now the wise men, the en-¹⁵chanters, have been brought in before me, that they should read this writing, and make known unto me the interpretation thereof: but they could not shew the interpretation of the thing. But I have heard of thee,¹⁶ that thou canst give interpretations, and loose knots: now if thou canst read the writing, and make known to me the interpretation thereof, thou shalt be clothed with purple, and have a chain of gold about thy neck, and shalt be the third ruler in the kingdom.

Then Daniel answered and said before the king,¹⁷ Let thy gifts be to thyself, and give thy rewards to another; nevertheless I will read the writing unto the king, and make known unto him the interpretation. O thou king, the Most High God gave Nebuchadnezzar¹⁸ thy father the kingdom, and greatness, and glory, and majesty; and because of the greatness that he gave¹⁹ him, all the peoples, nations, and languages trembled and feared before him: whom he would he slew, and whom he would be kept alive; and whom he would he raised up, and whom he would he put down. But when his²⁰ heart was lifted up, and his spirit was hardened that he dealt proudly, he was deposed from his kingly throne, and they took his glory from him: and he was driven²¹ from the sons of men; and his heart was made like the beasts, and his dwelling was with the wild asses; he was fed with grass like oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven: until he knew that the Most High God ruleth in the kingdom of men, and that he setteth up over it whomsoever he will. And thou, his son,²²

O Belshazzar, hast not humbled thine heart, though thou
 23 knewest all this ; but hast lifted up thyself against
 the Lord of heaven ; and they have brought the vessels
 of his house before thee, and thou and thy lords, thy
 wives and thy concubines, have drunk wine in them ;
 and thou hast praised the gods of silver, and gold, of
 brass, iron, wood, and stone, which see not, nor hear,
 nor know : and the God in whose hand thy breath is,
 and whose are all thy ways, him hast thou not glorified :

24 Then was the part of the hand sent from before
 25 him, and this writing was inscribed. And this is the
 writing that was inscribed, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, U-PHARSIN.
 26 This is the interpretation of the thing : MENE ; God
 hath numbered thy kingdom, and brought it to an end.
 27 TEKEL ; thou art weighed in the balances, and art
 28 found wanting. PERES ; thy kingdom is divided,
 29 and given to the Medes and Persians. Then com-
 manded Belshazzar, and they clothed Daniel with purple,
 and put a chain of gold about his neck, and made pro-
 clamations concerning him, that he should be the third
 30 ruler in the kingdom. In that night Belshazzar the
 Chaldean king was slain.

CHAPTER VI [*Aramaic*]

[In the Vulg. and Engl. Versions, ch. v. 31 ; in the
 Aram., vi. 1]. And Darius the Mede received the
 kingdom, being about threescore and two years old.

1 It pleased Darius to set over the kingdom an hun-
 dred and twenty satraps, which should be throughout the
 2 whole kingdom ; and over them three presidents, of
 whom Daniel was one ; that these satraps might give
 account unto them, and that the king should have no

damage. Then this Daniel was distinguished above the 3
presidents and the satraps, because an excellent spirit was
in him ; and the king was thinking to set him over the
whole realm. Then the presidents were seeking a cause- 4
of-complaint against Daniel as touching the kingdom ;
but they could find no cause-of-complaint nor fault ;
forasmuch as he was faithful, neither was there any error
or fault found in him. Then said these men, We shall 5
not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find
it against him concerning the law of his God.

Then these presidents and satraps came in tumultuously 6
to the king, and said thus unto him, King Darius, live
for ever. All the presidents of the kingdom, the 7
deputies and the satraps, the counsellors and the governors,
have consulted together that the king should establish a
statute, and make a strong interdict, that whosoever shall
ask a petition of any god or man for thirty days, save of
thee, O king, he shall be cast into the den of lions.
Now, O king, establish the interdict, and sign the writing, 8
that it be not changed, according to the law of the Medes
and Persians, which altereth not. Wherefore king Darius 9
signed the writing and the interdict.

And when Daniel knew that the writing was signed, 10
he went into his house ; (now his windows were open in
his upper-chamber toward Jerusalem ;) and he kneeled
upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave
thanks before his God, as he did aforetime. Then these 11
men came in tumultuously and found Daniel making
petition and supplication before his God.

Then they came near, and spake before the king 12
concerning the king's interdict ; Hast thou not signed an
interdict, that every man that shall make petition unto
any god or man within thirty days, save unto thee, O

- king, shall be cast into the den of lions? The king answered and said, The thing is true, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not.
- 13 Then answered they and said before the king, That Daniel, which is of the children of the captivity of Judah, regardeth not thee, O king, nor the interdict that thou hast signed, but maketh his petition three times a day.
- 14 Then the king, when he heard these words, was sore displeased, and set his heart on Daniel to deliver him : and he strove till the going down of the sun to
- 15 rescue him. Then these men came in tumultuously unto the king, and said unto the king, Know, O king, that it is a law of the Medes and Persians, that no interdict nor statute which the king establisheth may be changed.
- 16 Then the king commanded, and they brought Daniel, and cast him into the den of lions. Now the king spake and said unto Daniel, Thy God whom thou servest
- 17 continually, he will deliver thee. And a stone was brought, and laid upon the mouth of the den ; and the king sealed it with his own signet, and with the signet of his lords ; that nothing might be changed concerning Daniel.
- 18 Then the king went to his palace, and passed the night fasting : neither were instruments of music [*the translation is doubtful*] brought before him : and his sleep fled from
- 19 him. Then the king arose very early in the morning, and
- 20 went in haste unto the den of lions. And when he came near unto the den to Daniel, he cried with a sorrowful voice : the king spake and said to Daniel, O Daniel, servant of the living God, is thy God, whom thou servest con-
- 21 tinually, able to deliver thee from the lions? Then said
- 22 Daniel unto the king, O king, live for ever. My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths,

and they have not hurt me : forasmuch as before him innocency was found in me ; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt. Then was the king exceeding glad over him, and commanded that they should take Daniel up out of the den. So Daniel was taken up out of the den, and no manner of hurt was found upon him, because he had trusted in his God. And the king commanded, and they brought those men which had accused Daniel, and they cast them into the den of lions, them, their children, and their wives ; and the lions had the mastery of them, and brake all their bones in pieces, before ever they came at the bottom of the den.

Then king Darius wrote unto all the peoples, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth : Peace be multiplied unto you. I make a decree, that in all the dominion of my kingdom, men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel : for he is the living God, and stedfast for ever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end : he delivereth and rescueth, and he worketh signs and wonders in heaven and in earth ; who hath delivered Daniel from the power of the lions. So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian.

CHAPTER VII [*Aramaic*]

In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed : then he wrote the dream and told the sum of the matters. Daniel answered and said, I saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven were bursting forth upon the great sea. And four great beasts came

4 up from the sea, diverse one from another. The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings : I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked-out, and it was raised up from the earth, and made to stand upon its feet as a man, 5 and a man's heart was given to it. And behold another beast, a second, like to a bear, and it was raising up itself on one side, and three ribs in its mouth between its teeth : and it was said thus unto it, Arise, devour much 6 flesh. After this I beheld, and lo another, like a leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a bird ; the beast had also four heads ; and dominion was 7 given to it. After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, terrible and powerful, and strong exceedingly ; and it had great iron teeth : it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet : and it was diverse from all the beasts that were 8 before it ; and it had ten horns. I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another horn, a little (one), before which three of the first horns were plucked-up from the roots : and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking 9 great things. I beheld till thrones were placed, and the Ancient of days did sit : his raiment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like pure wool ; his throne was fiery flames, the wheels thereof burning fire. 10 A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him ; thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him : the 11 judgement was set, and the books were opened. I beheld at that time because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake ; I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and he was given to be 12 burned with fire. And as for the rest of the beasts,

their dominion was taken away : yet their lives were prolonged for a season and a time. I saw in the ¹³ night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and ¹⁴ glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him : his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

As for me, Daniel, my spirit was grieved in the ¹⁵ midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me. I came near unto one of them that stood by, and ¹⁶ asked him the truth concerning all this. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things. These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, ¹⁷ which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of ¹⁸ the Most High shall receive the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever. Then ¹⁹ I desired to know the truth concerning the fourth beast, which was diverse from all of them, exceeding terrible, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass ; which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet ; and concerning the ten horns that were on ²⁰ his head, and the other horn which came up, and before which three fell ; even that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows. I beheld, and the same horn ²¹ made war with the saints, and prevailed against them ; until the Ancient of days came, and judgement was given ²² to the saints of the Most High ; and the time came that the saints inherited the kingdom. Thus he said, ²³ The fourth beast shall be a fourth kingdom upon earth,

which shall be diverse from all the kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and
24 break it in pieces. And as for the ten horns, out of this kingdom shall ten kings arise: and another shall arise after them; and he shall be diverse from the
25 former, and he shall put down three kings. And he shall speak words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High: and he shall think to change the times and the law; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and half a time.
26 But the judgement shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end.
27 And the kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High: his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions
28 shall serve and obey him. Here is the end of the matter. As for me, Daniel, my thoughts much troubled me, and my countenance was changed in me: but I kept the matter in my heart.

[*N.B.—The Aramaic portion closes here.*]

CHAPTER VIII [Hebrew]

1 In the third year of the reign of king Belshazzar a vision appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that
2 which appeared unto me at the first. And I saw in the vision, and it happened as I saw (it) that I was in Shushan the fortress, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw
3 in the vision that I was by the river Ulai. Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and behold, there stood before the river a ram which had two horns; and the two horns were high; but one was higher than the other, and the

higher came up last. I saw the ram pushing westward 4
and northward, and southward; and no beasts could
stand before him; neither was there any that could
deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will,
and magnified himself. And as I was paying-attention, 5
behold, an he-goat came from the west over the face of
the whole earth, and touched not the ground: and the
goat had a notable horn between his eyes. And he 6
came to the ram that had the two horns, which I saw
standing before the river, and ran upon him in the fury
of his power. And I saw him come close unto the 7
ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and
smote the ram, and brake his two horns; and there was
no power in the ram to stand before him: but he cast
him down to the ground, and trampled upon him; and
there was none that could deliver the ram out of his
hand. And the he-goat magnified himself exceedingly: 8
and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and
instead of it there came up four notable horns toward the
four winds of heaven. And out of one of them came 9
forth one horn very-little, which waxed exceeding great,
toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the
glorious land. And it waxed great even to the 10
host of heaven; and some of the host and of the stars
it cast down to the ground, and trampled upon them.
Yea, it magnified itself, even to the prince of the 11
host; and it took away from him the continual burnt-
offering, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down.
And an host was given over to it, together with the 12
continual [burnt-offering] through transgression; and it
cast down truth to the ground, and it did and prospered.
Then I heard one holy (one) speaking; and one holy 13
one said unto that certain-one which spake, How long

shall be the vision concerning the continual [burnt-offering], and regarding the transgression which maketh desolate, to give both the sanctuary and the host to
14 be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Until evening morning, two thousand and three hundred; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.

15 And it came to pass when I, even I Daniel, had seen the vision, that I sought to understand it; and, behold, there stood before me [one] like the appearance of a
16 man. And I heard a voice of a man between (the banks of) Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man
17 to understand the vision. So he came near where I stood; and when he came, I was affrighted, and fell upon my face; but he said unto me, Understand, O son of man; for the vision belongeth to the time of the
18 end. Now as he was speaking with me, I fell into a deep sleep with my face toward the ground: but
19 he touched me, and set me upright. And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the latter end of the indignation: for it belongeth to the
20 appointed time of the end. The ram which thou sawest that had the two horns, they are the kings of
21 Media and Persia. And the rough he-goat is the king of Greece: and the great horn that is between his
22 eyes is the first king. And as for that which was broken, in the place whereof four stood up, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not with his
23 power. And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors fill up the measure of their iniquity, a king of fierce countenance, and skilled in
24 riddles, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not through his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper and do his

pleasure : and he shall destroy the mighty ones and the holy people. And through his policy he shall cause 25 craft to prosper in his hand ; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and in [their] security shall he destroy many ; he shall also stand up against the prince of princes ; but he shall be broken without hand. And 26 the vision of the evening and the morning which hath been told is true : but shut thou up the vision ; for it belongeth to many days to come. And I Daniel 27 fainted, and was sick certain days ; then I rose up, and did the king's buisness : and I was astonished at the vision, but none understood it.

CHAPTER IX [*Hebrew*]

In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, 1 of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans ; in the first year of his 2 reign I Daniel understood by the books the number of the years, whereof the word of Jahveh came to Jeremiah the prophet, for the accomplishing of the desolations of Jerusalem, even seventy years. And I set my face 3 unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes. And I prayed 4 unto Jahveh my God, and made confession, and said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his com- 5 mandments ; we have sinned, and have dealt perversely, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even turning 6 aside from thy precepts and from thy judgements : neither have we hearkened unto thy servants the prophets, which spake in thy name to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of the land.

- 7 O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion of face, as at this day ; to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, that are near, and that are far off, through all the countries whither thou hast driven them, because of their trespass that they have trespassed against thee.
- 8 O Lord, to us belongeth confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we
- 9 have sinned against thee. To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses ; for we have rebelled
- 10 against him ; neither have we obeyed the voice of Jahveh our God, to walk in his laws, which he set
- 11 before us by his servants the prophets. Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy law, even turning aside, that they should not obey thy voice : therefore hath the curse been poured out upon us, and the oath that is written in the law of Moses the servant of God ; for we have sinned
- 12 against him. And he hath confirmed his words, which he spake against us, and against our judges that judged us, by bringing upon us a great evil : for under the whole heaven hath not been done as hath been done
- 13 upon Jerusalem. As it is written in the law of Moses, all this evil is come upon us ; yet have we not intreated the favour of Jahveh our God, that we should turn from our iniquities and have discernment in thy truth.
- 14 Therefore hath Jahveh watched over the evil, and brought it upon us : for Jahveh our God is righteous in all his works which he doeth, and we have not obeyed his voice.
- 15 And now, O Lord our God, that hast brought thy people forth out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand, and hast gotten thee renown, as at this day ;
- 16 we have sinned, we have done wickedly. O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, let thine anger and

thy fury, I pray thee, be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain: because for our sins, and for the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and thy people are become a reproach to all round about us. Now therefore, O our God, hearken unto the prayer ¹⁷ of thy servant, and to his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake. O my God, incline thine ear, and ¹⁸ hear: open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy name: for we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses, but for thy great mercies. O Lord, hear; O ¹⁹ Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not; for thine own sake, O my God, because thy city and thy people are called by thy name.

And whiles I was speaking, and praying, and ²⁰ confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, and presenting my supplication before the Lord my God for the holy mountain of my God; yea, whiles I was ²¹ speaking in prayer, the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, [like one] thoroughly worn out, touched me about the time of the evening oblation. And he instructed me, and talked with me, and said, ²² O Daniel, I am now come forth to instruct thee in understanding. At the beginning of thy supplications ²³ the commandment went forth, and I am come to tell thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore consider the matter, and understand the vision.

Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people and ²⁴ upon thy holy city, to put an end to the transgression, and to make an end of sin-offering, and to make atonement for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness,

and to seal up vision and prophet, and to anoint the
25 most holy. Know therefore and discern, that from the
going forth of the commandment to restore and to build
Jerusalem unto Messiah, a prince, shall be seven weeks,
and threescore and two weeks; it shall be built again,
26 with street and trench, and in troublous times. And
after the threescore and two weeks shall the Messiah be
cut off, and he shall have nothing: and the city and the
sanctuary the people of the prince that shall come shall
destroy: and its end shall be in the flood, and even
unto an end shall be war;—desolations are determined.
27 And he shall make a firm covenant with the many for
one week: and during the half of the [*or, of that*] week
he shall cause sacrifice and oblation to cease; and upon a
wing of abominations shall come one that maketh desolate;
and even unto the consummation, and that determined,
shall wrath be poured out upon a desolator.

CHAPTER X [*Hebrew*]

1 In the third year of Cyrus king of Persia a thing was
revealed unto Daniel, whose name was called Belteshazzar;
and true [*lit. truth*] is the word, and a long warfare: and
he understood the thing, and had understanding of the
2 vision. In those days I Daniel was mourning three whole
3 weeks. I ate no bread of desire, neither came flesh
nor wine into my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at
4 all, till three whole weeks were fulfilled. And in the
four and twentieth day of the first month, as I was by the
5 side of the great river, which is Hiddekel, I lifted up
mine eyes, and looked, and behold a man clothed in linen,
6 whose loins were girded with pure gold of Uphaz: his
body also was like the beryl, and his face as the appearance

of lightning, and his eyes as lamps of fire, and his arms and his feet like the appearance of burnished brass, and the voice of his words like the voice of a multitude. And I Daniel alone saw the vision: for the men 7 that were with me saw not the vision: but a great quaking fell upon them, and they fled to hide themselves. So I was left alone, and saw this great vision, and 8 there remained no strength in me; for my comeliness was turned in me into corruption, and I retained no strength. Yet heard I the voice of his words: and 9 when I heard the voice of his words, after I had fallen into a deep sleep on my face, with my face toward the ground. And, behold, a hand touched me, which made 10 me stagger upon my knees and upon the palms of my hands. And he said unto me, O Daniel, thou man 11 greatly beloved, understand the words that I speak unto thee, and stand upright; for unto thee am I now sent: and when he had spoken this word unto me, I stood trembling. Then said he unto me, Fear not, Daniel; for from 12 the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and to humble thyself before thy God, thy words were heard: and I am come for thy words' sake. But 13 the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days; but lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me: and I was left there with the kings of Persia. Now I am come to make thee 14 understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for the vision is yet for many days. And 15 when he had spoken unto me according to these words, I set my face toward the ground, and was dumb. And, behold, one like the similitude of the sons 16 of men touched my lips: then I opened my mouth, and spake and said unto him that stood before me, O

my lord, by reason of the vision my sorrows are turned
17 upon me, and I retain no strength. For how can
the servant of this my lord talk with this my lord? for
as for me, straightway there remained no strength in
18 me, neither was there breath left in me. Then there
touched me again [one] like the appearance of a man,
19 and he strengthened me. And he said, O man greatly
beloved, fear not: peace be unto thee, be strong, yea,
be strong. And when he spake unto me, I was
strengthened, and said, Let my lord speak; for thou
20 hast strengthened me. Then said he, Knowest
thou wherefore I am come unto thee? and now will
I return to fight with the prince of Persia: and as I go
21 forth, then behold, the prince of Greece cometh. But
I will tell thee that which is inscribed in a writing of
truth: and there is none that holdeth with me against
these, but Michael your prince.

CHAPTER XI [*Hebrew—Continuation of preceding*]

1 And as for me, in the first year of Darius the Mede,
I stood up to confirm and strengthen him.

2 And now will I shew thee the truth. Behold, there
shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth
shall be far richer than they all: and when he is waxed
strong through his riches, he shall stir up the whole, the
3 kingdom of Greece. And a mighty king shall stand
up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according
4 to his will. And while he is standing-up, his kingdom
shall be broken, and shall be divided to the four winds of
heaven; but not to his posterity, nor according to his

dominion wherewith he ruled ; for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others beside these.

And the king of the south shall be strong, and be one of his princes ; and be stronger than he, and have dominion ; a great dominion shall be his dominion. And at the end of years they shall make-an-alliance together ; and the daughter of the king of the south shall come to the king of the north in order to make an agreement : but she shall not retain the strength of arm ; neither shall he stand, nor his arm ; and she shall be given up, and they that brought her, and he that begat her, and he that strengthened her in those times. But out of a shoot from her roots shall one stand up in his place, and shall come to the army, and shall come to a fortress of the king of the north, and shall deal against them, and prevail : and also their gods, with their molten images, with their goodly vessels of silver and of gold, shall he bring with the captives into Egypt ; and he shall stand for years away from the king of the north. And he shall come into the kingdom of the king of the south, and shall return to his own land.

And his sons shall carry on war, and gather a multitude of great forces, which shall even come, and "overflow and pass over" [Isa. viii. 8] and return, and shall carry on war even to [his] fortress.

And the king of the south shall be aroused to anger, and shall go forth and war with him, with the king of the north, and he [the king of the north] shall put in array a mighty multitude, and the multitude shall be given into his hand [*i.e.* of the king of the south]. And the multitude shall be swept away, and his heart shall be lifted up : and he shall cast down ten thousands, and shall not be strong. And the king of the north shall

return, and shall put in array a multitude greater than the former ; and at the end of the times, [even of] years, he shall come with a great army, and with much substance.

14 And in those times many shall stand up against the king of the south : and the sons of the violent of thy people shall lift up themselves to establish the vision ;

15 but they shall fall. And the king of the north shall come, and cast up a mount, and take a fortified city : and the arms of the south shall not stand, neither his chosen people, for shall be there no strength to stand.

16 And he that cometh against him shall do according to his will, and none shall stand before him : and he shall stand in the glorious land, and destruction in his hand.

17 And he shall set his face to come with the strength of his whole kingdom, and upright men with him, and he shall do so ; and a daughter of women he shall give to him to destroy her ; and she shall not stand, neither shall

18 she be for him. And he shall turn-round his face towards the coast-lands, and shall take many ; but a commander shall cause his reproach to him to cease ; yea, moreover, 19 he shall return his reproach to him. And he shall turn-round his face toward the fortresses of his own land : and he shall stumble and fall, and shall not be found.

20 Then shall stand up in his place one who shall cause an oppressor to pass over the glory of the kingdom : and in a few days he shall be broken, and not in anger, and not in war.

21 And in his place shall stand up a contemptible person, to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom : but he shall come in suddenly, and shall

22 obtain the kingdom by flatteries. And the arms of a [or, *the*] flood shall be swept away from before him, and they shall be shivered in pieces, and also a prince

of covenant. And from the time of entering into alliance 23
with him he shall work deceitfully, and shall go up, and
become strong with a small nation. Suddenly shall he 24
come even into the fattest places of a province; and
he shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor
his fathers' fathers; spoil, and plunder, and riches he
shall scatter among them, yea, against fortresses shall he
devise devices, and (that) for a time.

And he shall stir up his power and his courage against 25
the king of the south with a great army, and the king of
the south shall stir up himself to the battle with a great
army and strong exceedingly: but he shall not stand, for
they shall devise devices against him. And they that 26
eat of his dainties shall destroy him, and his army shall
overflow, and many shall fall down slain. And as 27
for both these kings, their hearts shall be towards
mischief, and at one table they shall speak lies. But
it shall not prosper; for yet an end shall be at the
appointed time. And he shall return into his land with 28
great riches; and his heart shall be against the holy
covenant, and he shall do, and return to his own land.

At the time appointed he shall return, and come into 29
the south; but it shall not be in the latter time as it
was in the former. For ships of Kittim shall come 30
against him; therefore he shall be grieved, and shall
return, and have indignation against the holy covenant,
and shall do: and he shall return, and have regard unto
them that forsake the holy covenant.

And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall 31
profane the sanctuary, even the fortress, and shall take
away the continual [burnt-offering], and they shall set
up the abomination which desolates. And such as do 32
wickedly against the covenant shall he pervert by

flatteries : but the people that know their God shall be
33 strong, and do. And they that give-instruction among
the people shall teach the many : and they shall fall by
the sword and by flame, by captivity and by spoil, many
34 days. Now when they are stumbling, they shall be
holpen with a little help, but many shall join them-
35 selves unto them with flatteries. And some of them
that give-instruction shall stumble—to refine them, and
to purify, and to make them white—even to the time
of the end : because it is yet for the time appointed.

36 And the king shall do according to his will ; and
he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every
god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God
of gods : and he shall prosper till the indignation be
accomplished ; for that which is determined shall be done.

37 Neither shall he regard the gods of his fathers, nor
the desire of women, nor regard any god : for he shall
38 magnify himself above all. But in his place shall he
honour the god of fortresses : and a god whom his
fathers knew not shall he honour with gold, and silver,
39 and with precious stones, and pleasant things. And he
shall deal with the strongest fortresses by the help of
a strange god ; whosoever acknowledgeth him he will
increase with glory : and he shall cause them to rule over
many, and shall divide the land for a price.

40 And at the time of the end shall the king of the
south contend with him : and the king of the north shall
come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and
with horsemen, and with many ships ; and he shall enter
into the countries, and “ shall overflow and pass through.”

41 He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many
countries shall be overthrown : but these shall be

delivered out of his hand, Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon. He shall stretch 42 forth his hand also upon the countries : and the land of Egypt shall not escape. But he shall have power 43 over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt : and the Libyans and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps. But tidings out of 44 the east and out of the north shall trouble him : and he shall go forth with great fury to destroy and utterly to make away many. And he shall plant the tents 45 of his palace between the sea and the glorious holy mountain ; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.

CHAPTER XII [*Hebrew—Conclusion of the prophecy*]

And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great 1 prince which standeth for the children of thy people : and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time : and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that 2 sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that give-instruction shall shine as the brightness 3 of the Expanse [Gen. i. 6] ; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever. But thou, 4 O Daniel, shut up the words and seal the book, even to the time of the end : many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.

Then I Daniel looked, and, behold, there stood 5 other two, the one on the brink of the river on this side, and the other on the brink of the river on that side.

6 And one said to the man clothed in linen, who was
above the waters of the river, How long shall it be to the
7 end of these wonders? And I heard the man clothed
in linen, who was above the waters of the river, when
he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven,
and swore by him that liveth for ever that it shall be for a
time, times, and an half; and when they have made an
end of breaking in pieces the power of a holy people,
8 all these things shall be finished. And I heard, but I
understood not: then said I, O my lord, what shall be
9 the latter-end of these things? And he said, Go thy
way, Daniel: for the words are shut up and sealed till
10 the time of the end. Many shall purify themselves, and
make themselves white, and be refined; but the wicked
shall do wickedly; and none of the wicked shall under-
11 stand: but they that be wise shall understand. And
from the time that the continual [burnt-offering] shall be
taken away, and an abomination that maketh desolate set
up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety
12 days. Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the
thousand three hundred and five and thirty days. But
13 go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest,
and shalt stand in thy lot, at the end of the days.

Daniel and his Prophecies

CHAPTER I

THE BOOK OF DANIEL IN GENERAL

THE Book of Daniel is one of the most remarkable of the writings contained in the so-called Canon of the Old Testament Scriptures. Like the Book of Ezra, it is written partly in Hebrew and partly in Aramaic. That fact distinguishes those two books from all other sacred writings. In the case of Ezra the Aramaic is confined to documents from Aramaic originals. In the case of Daniel the reason for the use of both Aramaic and Hebrew is not so clear.¹

After the return from captivity, the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, as well as Malachi, the last of the Hebrew prophets, naturally wrote their books in the sacred tongue, which befitted men whose work was to raise up that which

¹ The Aramaic in which portions of the Books of Ezra and Daniel is written is not the Eastern Aramaic, which would have been expected to have been used by persons dwelling long in Babylonia, but the Western Aramaic, which at a later date was vernacular in Palestine. The differences, however, on the other hand, between the Eastern and Western Aramaic, exhibited in the small extent of the literature in existence in Biblical Aramaic, are not by any means so great as to render it safe to put too much stress upon any arguments based thereon.

was fallen in Israel. The language of those prophets (as indeed was also the case with the language of Ezra) differed but little from the Hebrew of the earlier prophets.¹

The reason for the employment of two languages in the Book of Daniel is a question upon which scholars are not agreed. Eminent critics have sought to explain it from the subject-matter itself. Grotius maintained that the portions of the work which mainly affected the Jewish nation were written in Hebrew, and that the Aramaic portions concern more particularly the Gentile nations. That hypothesis, however, hopelessly breaks down when considered in detail, and notably in an examination of the contents of the last vision of Daniel. Other scholars, as Merx, maintain that the portions of Daniel in Aramaic were intended for the common people, by whom Aramaic was better understood than Hebrew, and that the more

¹ The Aramaic found in the Book of Ezra closely resembles that of the Book of Daniel. The grammatical forms in both works are substantially the same. The Aramaic of those two books is known as "Biblical Aramaic," the instances of Aramaic in the other Biblical books being confined to single words or phrases, with an isolated verse in Jeremiah (ch. x. 11). Under the same heading the Hebrew words and phrases in the New Testament have been included. Biblical Aramaic differs more from the Aramaic of the Targums than the latter differs from the later Palestinian. This will be seen from an examination of the grammatical forms of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic set forth in Dalman's important work, *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch nach den Idiomen des Palästinischen Talmud und Midrasch des Onkelostargum* (Cod. Socini, 84) und der Jerusalemischen Targume zum Pentateuch (Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1894). The Targums, moreover, have undergone considerable recension in form, as can be seen by comparing any ordinary edition of Onkelos with that edited by Berliner in 1884. Bevan and Nöldeke have repeatedly suggested that the Aramaic portions of the Old Testament were revised in later times. That fact ought not to be forgotten, as it has been too often.

profound portions of the book containing the great visions were written in Hebrew. That hypothesis also does not coincide with the fact that the introduction to the book, which had to be read at the outset, is in Hebrew, as are the prayers in ch. ix. and ch. x., while ch. vii., though in Aramaic, is one of the more profound portions of the work. Others, again (Behrmann among the number), maintain that the writer was more at home in writing Aramaic than Hebrew. He commenced to use the Aramaic language in ch. ii. 4, when describing the Chaldean wise men as addressing Nebuchadnezzar in that language. The writer then made use of Aramaic with the distinct object of leading his reader to conclude that such was the language of the Chaldeans; and having once begun in Aramaic, he thoughtlessly continued his work for some chapters in the language which he found came more easily to his mind. Apart from other considerations, such a hypothesis, as has often been remarked, makes the writer guilty of a forgetfulness of purpose for which it is impossible satisfactorily to account.¹

¹ Professor G. Jahn of Königsberg, one of the latest critics of the book, has propounded a new reason why the book has been handed down in two languages. He maintains (see p. 61) that the LXX. text is an earlier form of the original than the Massoretic Hebrew—one of his arguments being that the LXX. give certain proper names in the Hebrew form, while in the Massoretic text the names are Persian. The Massoretic scribes, he maintains, desired to impart to the book a “local colouring” (*Localcolorit*), and thus to make it appear genuine and ancient. Hence the scribes translated it into Aramaic, commencing, with a definite object in view, with the speech of the Chaldeans in ch. ii. Aramaic, once commenced, was continued down to the end of ch. vii., when it was dropped, because the translator found the second portion of the book abounded with exegetical and textual difficulties which made translation into Aramaic difficult, and “in part impossible”!

A considerable number of modern critics have sought to account in a more natural way for the difference of language. With considerable variety of detail, they consider the use of the Hebrew and Aramaic arose from copies of the book existing in both languages. The book is supposed to have been originally written in Hebrew and translated into Aramaic, and some incomplete copy of the Hebrew may have been completed by the addition of a portion from the Aramaic. Or, which is the more probable theory, the entire book was written originally in Aramaic, and translated later into Hebrew. The Hebrew in many places presents the appearance of a translation from an Aramaic original. In the latter case the editor of the book as it lies before us, in place of translating into Hebrew from ch. ii. 4 onward, copied the Aramaic original.

In the *Critical Commentary* on ch. ii. 4, an explanation of the note embedded in that verse, "*In Aramith, or Aramaic*" (see trans. p. 3), will be found given, along with a parallel passage in Ezra, where the same formula recurs. In Daniel and in Ezra, the phrase is used in a very definite sense, namely, to describe the language of the document actually quoted in the passage.

The Book of Daniel (although the unity of its authorship is now generally admitted by scholars) presents the appearance of being composed of a number of extracts drawn from a larger work. Those excerpts are to a considerable extent independent of one another. The first chapter forms the introduction to the work, and is necessary in order to give some preliminary account of Daniel and his three friends whose history is related in chapters ii. and iii. No mention is made of those three friends after the close of ch. iii.

On the assumption of the historical truth of the narratives (the reasons on which that assumption is based will be set forth in due course), the vision of the great image or colossus in ch. ii. may have had some connection with the setting up of the golden image described in ch. iii. Ch. iv., however, is entirely independent of the narratives which precede or follow it—unless, indeed, the “band of iron and brass” (mentioned in ver. 23) be supposed to have reference to the brass and iron of the third and fourth kingdoms, portrayed in the dream of the great metallic colossus.

The next portion of the book (ch. v.) contains a grand and vivid description of Belshazzar’s feast. That chapter, and ch. iv., are two of the grandest narratives contained in Old Testament Scripture. But chapters v. and vi. are almost independent narratives. The connection even between the two has to be drawn out, according to the fancy of the commentator, from the verse which, according to the Vulgate and other Versions, forms the conclusion of ch. v. In the Aramaic text, however, the verse in question stands in its proper place at the opening of ch. vi.

Similarly, the visions narrated in the subsequent chapters are to a large extent unconnected with one another. Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of the great image (ch. ii.), with Daniel’s vision of the four beasts (ch. vii.), no doubt mutually supplement one another and present the same outlines. The vision of ch. viii. (in spite of vigorous attempts made by modern critics to read into the prophecy that which it does not contain) is wholly independent of ch. vii. Nor has ch. viii. any connection with the chapter which succeeds, while ch. ix. is again an independent prophecy. The closing three chapters of the book (closely connected though they be with one another)

are also independent of the preceding portions of the book. Such facts are strongly in favour of the hypothesis that the Book of Daniel, as it has come down to us, consists of extracts from a larger and more comprehensive work.

No scholar who had not some distinct hypothesis to uphold could for a moment have suggested that Daniel, mentioned twice by Ezekiel in the phrase "Noah, Daniel, and Job" (ch. xiv. 14, 20), could be any other than the Daniel whose history is recorded in this book. The allusion to Daniel in the prophecies of Ezekiel, when denouncing the judgment of Jehovah against the prince of Tyre, falls in completely with what is related in our book: "Behold, thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that they can hide from thee" (Ezek. xxviii. 3). It is lamentable to see the perverse ingenuity with which modern scholars have endeavoured to suggest that the Daniel to whom Ezekiel referred was some ancient patriarch who was, like Enoch, universally renowned for piety and wisdom (although not a vestige of any such tradition has survived), and was therefore mentioned along with Noah and Job, the well-known heroes of ancient writ.¹

Moreover, either Ezekiel quotes Daniel, or Daniel quotes from the prophecies of Ezekiel. In Ezek. ix. 2, Ezekiel speaks of "one man," the mysterious scribe who had a writer's inkhorn by his side, as "clothed with linen." Daniel's glorious visitant, spoken of in ch. x. 5, is similarly described. The feet of the latter celestial visitor are stated as "like in appearance to burnished brass" (Dan. x. 6), and the same expression is used of

¹ Dr Pusey rightly observes that, "unless Ezekiel had meant to speak of a contemporary, over against the contemporary prince of Tyre, the wisdom of Solomon had been the more obvious instance to select" (p. 105).

the living beings described in Ezek. i. 7. Other passages similar in Ezekiel and Daniel might also be mentioned. It is, however, impossible to prove that Ezekiel quoted from Daniel, and not Daniel from Ezekiel. But the traditional view, which supposes that Ezekiel was acquainted with Daniel's book, as being his contemporary, harmonises with these facts.

In the Bampton Lectures on Zechariah,¹ the close connection has been pointed out between the four war-chariots of Zechariah's seventh vision (ch. vi. 1-8) and the four world-kings of Daniel. Those four war-chariots of wrath are the four warlike empires of Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome. If the interpretation there given be correct—and it is as old as Jerome, and probably older—it is another remarkable instance in which the traditional view of Daniel harmonises with the facts of the Old Testament as understood up to very recent times. If the Book of Daniel be genuine, Zechariah, when at Babylon, must have been acquainted with its prophecies, and consequently it would be likely that alongside of the ideas of the earlier prophet certain distinct modifications would be found reflected in the predictions of the later. For modifications in details and expressions might naturally be looked for. The general agreement between the two books on this point is remarkable (see p. 56). The similarity in some expressions which exists between the language used in the prayers of Nehemiah and that of Daniel (ch. ix.) has been by some critics adduced to prove that Daniel's prayer was imitated from that

¹ *Zechariah and his Prophecies considered in relation to Modern Criticism*. With a Grammatical and Critical Commentary and new translation. (The Bampton Lectures for 1878.) London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1879. Second edition.

of Nehemiah. Dr Pusey has, however, fairly shown (pp. 357-9) that the conclusion is not correct, but that both Nehemiah's prayers, as well as that of Daniel, are really based on the Pentateuch or Jeremiah.

The true lines of "defence" of the Book of Daniel do not rest upon the foundations laid by Hengstenberg or Pusey. It may, indeed, be unwise to abandon points which have not yet been proved to be unsound, but the real defence of the Book of Daniel ought to a large extent to be based upon the internal evidence presented in the book itself. Many of the objections brought against it by modern critics rest upon mere hypotheses.¹

There is nothing worthy to be regarded as real "evidence" concerning the settlement of the so-called Canon of the Old Testament Scriptures. No one can prove when or by what authority the books of the Old Testament were arranged into three distinct divisions. It is vain to speak of three distinct canons, and to assign, with Bishop H. E. Ryle and others, a date for the closing up of each division. Those attempts rest upon un-historical conjectures. Hence it is unfair to draw any conclusions whatever from the position which the Book of Daniel occupied in the so-called Palestinian Canon of the Old Testament Scriptures. No discredit was intended to be done to the Book of the Psalms by placing it at the head of the K'thubim or Hagiographa. Nor ought

¹ Pusey is right in contending that Daniel must be either a true writing or a discreditable forgery. Hitzig candidly admits (in his *Daniel*, p. x.) that, although the authors of the Books of Koheleth and Wisdom were fully justified in using the name of Solomon as a literary device, the author of the Book of Daniel (if that book be not really the production of the prophet) was guilty of putting forth a forged (*untergeschobene*) writing with the intention of deceiving his readers, even though he may have had a good object in view.

any argument against the antiquity of the Book of Daniel to be deduced from the fact that it is found in that closing division of the Jewish Scriptures. The sacred books recognised by the Jewish Church in the time of our Lord were endorsed by our Lord as authentic, not only by the numerous quotations which He made from the greater number of them (as individually inspired books and as portions of a great inspired whole), but also from the allusion made to the threefold division of the books (Luke xxiv. 44), which is in full accordance with what has been deduced as probable from other sources, such as the prologue of the Wisdom of Ben Sirach, 2 Macc. ii. 13, etc. On what lines, however, the final editors of the Hebrew Scriptures proceeded when they placed one book in one division and others in another nothing is known. No records are extant of the decisions of "the Wise Men" of Israel upon any such subjects. Mere hypotheses, however probable, must not be assumed to be true, and then argued from as if they were ascertained facts of history.

The statements made in various places in the Talmuds and Midrashim concerning "the Great Synagogue" supposed to have been convened by Ezra after the return from captivity, to put in order the sacred books and to restore whatever might be found defective in their texts, rest upon no solid historical foundation. All such statements were put forth centuries after the days of Ezra. Those statements, however, ought not to be viewed as wholly fabulous. Kuenen and Robertson Smith have too lightly cast aside such statements as worthless.¹ The

¹ Upon the question of "the men of the Great Synagogue" and the critiques of Krochmel, Kuenen, and others, see Excursus III. at the end of *Kohelleth considered in reference to Modern Criticism and Modern Pessimism*; and also Excursus I. on "The Talmud and

story set forth in the Tract Aboth is not free, indeed, from historical difficulties. The unwillingness of the Jews to admit that any gaps existed in the evidence in favour of the sacred writings led in later times to ingenious attempts being made to derive the requisite information concerning "the men of the Great Synagogue" and their work from Biblical sources. The failure of those attempts (when examined into by critics) does not, however, justify those critics in their turn in seeking to relegate the whole story to the region of fable. The work ascribed to "the men of the Great Synagogue" in relation to the Old Testament Canon (*Baba Bathra*, 14*b* and 15*a*) was a work which had become absolutely necessary both after the return from captivity¹ and after the apostasy of the priests which immediately preceded the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. The apostasy of the priests and leaders in Israel led to the attempt on the part of that king to stamp out altogether the worship

the Old Testament Canon." Bishop H. E. Ryle has two valuable excursuses on the same subjects in his work on *The Canon of the Old Testament*, but he has passed over several points noticed in my excursuses which are of considerable importance.

¹ It may be well, perhaps, to draw attention here to the fact that in *Baba Bathra*, 14*b* and 15*a*, "the men of the Great Synagogue" are said to have written Ezekiel and the Twelve (Minor Prophets), Daniel, and the Roll of Esther. The word *בבא* is not used in the sense of *to compose*, nor can it be distinctly proved that it is employed in this passage in the sense *to introduce* into the canon (though employed elsewhere in that sense); but it may imply *committed to consecutive writing* in proper order the books which existed in fragments or portions, and were now put together in proper form. In other words, "the men of the Great Synagogue" are said to have edited those books. See essay on "The Talmud and the Old Testament Canon" appended to my work on *Ecclesiastes in relation to Modern Criticism and Pessimism* (Donnellan Lectures) (Hodder & Stoughton, 1883).

of Jehovah. There must necessarily have been a wholesale destruction of copies of the Scriptures at the time of the capture of Jerusalem by the Babylonians and during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc. i. 56, 57). There is no reason to be surprised at the imperfections which are apparent on the face of the Hebrew Scriptures, nor at the fact that it must have been hard to preserve the sacred writings at all intact in days of disorder and irreligion. Hence such matters must necessarily have been placed under the direction of some body of wise men or scribes, like "the men of Hezekiah" mentioned in Prov. xxv. 1.

The consideration of such facts leads us to maintain that the internal evidences of genuineness of certain Old Testament writings are more to be relied on than the external evidences. There is little reason to wonder, therefore, that a book like that of Daniel should have come down to later times in a somewhat fragmentary condition, and for the same reasons we are not so much impressed by considerations, which modern scholars have been inclined to press too far, drawn from the precise language, grammar, and phraseology of the several books. Those considerations are not, indeed, without a certain distinct value, but higher considerations must also be permitted to have their weight. It is probable that the Book of Daniel, as now in existence, had to be made up out of fragments collected from all sources. Those fragments might have contained the narratives and prophecies of a larger work. Some of them may have been translations of the Aramaic original; others, perhaps, were copies, more or less complete, of portions of the original work.

For believers in the twentieth century after Christ it is

sufficient to know that the book, however re-edited under the circumstances of those stormy days, received national recognition. When the importance of its prophecies was recognised in the days of the Maccabees, the book began to be imitated by other writers. It was during that era translated into Greek, and in that form sundry additions were made to the narrative portion.¹ It was, moreover, not only translated, but several of its prophecies were interpreted in that Greek translation. All this occurred in the thirty or forty years after the downfall of Antiochus Epiphanes. The Divine sanction generally was given to the compilation accepted by the Palestinian Jews as the work of "Daniel the prophet" by our Lord Jesus Christ, and afterwards the book was referred to by His apostles. Those who reject that authority as insufficient will, of course, to the end of time continue to amuse themselves with mere "conjectures." The basis, however, of most of those conjectures is the partial or total rejection of all that is known as "the miraculous."²

The Christian critic must, however, always be ready to consider and examine the arguments against the genuineness of the book which have been brought forward by modern critics. Such a critic cannot, however, commence his investigations with the assumption that all that savours of "the miraculous" is false. He ought not to ignore the

¹ Such as the "Story of Susannah," "Bel and the Dragon," and the "Song of the Three Children."

² Knobel, *Prophetismus der Hebräer*, vol. ii. p. 401, lays it down as "a historical canon, the tenableness of which cannot be doubtful," that no writings which contain miraculous relations can be considered as written contemporaneously with those supposed events. The very mention of miraculous accounts in the Book of Daniel, in that critic's opinion, proves that it was not written at the date at which the writer represents it as having been composed.

fact that the first "attack" made on the book—that of Porphyry—was made with the direct object of overthrowing the arguments drawn from it in favour of Christianity, and that even in the present day the majority of those critics who treat its narratives as fictitious, and its prophecies as written after the events alluded to, consists of persons who, if Christians in name, have eliminated from their creed all belief in the miraculous. It is quite true that in more recent times some earnest believers have been led to take a similar view of the book. This is not the place to discuss the causes of that change of position. The sad fact is, that eminent Christians, like Franz Delitzsch in Germany, Dean Farrar and others in England, have on this question, to use the language of St Luke (Acts xxvii. 17), struck sail, and so have been driven tossed with the tempest on the sea of modern criticism.

Professor Bevan (in the General Introduction to his Critical Commentary) seems to sneer at the "defenders" of Daniel. In doing so, he points to the change which has in recent years come over "conservative theologians." When, however, he observes that "scarcely any two of these apologists are agreed as to which pieces should be 'defended' and which should be abandoned," he surely must have been forgetful of the long list that could be made of the "assailants," who have in numberless passages put forth hypothesis upon hypothesis which have ultimately been abandoned. Bevan's own words (p. 158) on the interpretation of ch. ix. 26, 27 may be adduced as an illustration of the bewildering "results" of the novel hypotheses of modern critics, while such scholars of the present day as Winckler and Jahn should at least be borne in mind when an attempt is made to speak of the "positive" results of modern criticism.

Many, however, of the glaring historical discrepancies paraded by the earlier leaders of the modern school, such as Bertholdt, de Wette, Ewald, Hitzig, and others, have long since been allowed to drop out of sight. Much, however, is still to be learned by the study of the older commentators, and even of those too much despised "defenders," as Hengstenberg and Hävernick.

The traditional view has a great deal of evidence distinctly in its favour. The testimony of Ezekiel already alluded to, and incidentally given in proof of the existence of Daniel as a man of supereminent wisdom in the Exilian period, must not be forgotten. The modern critics are essentially weak in their attempts to invent a credible hypothesis to meet the difficulty which confronts them on that point.

Further, Zechariah, the great prophet of the Restoration, alludes to Daniel's four empires in his description of the four war-chariots which executed God's wrath upon a guilty world (Zech. vi. ; see p. 49). Zechariah expressly imitates Daniel in speaking of "the horns" which scattered Israel and Judah (Zech. ii. 1-4). Zechariah's prophecies concerning the war of Israel against Greece, although there is no similarity in the language with the similar prophecies in Daniel, have in substance much in common. The Maccabean contest is spoken of in Zech. x. The rejection of the good Shepherd of Israel, depicted in Zech. xi., has its essential counterpart in Daniel's prophecy of the Seventy Weeks (Dan. ix.).

There is a long period of one hundred and seventy years, from Artaxerxes I. down to the days of Alexander the Great, which is a perfect blank in Jewish annals. Only one incident connected with Jewish history is recorded during that long period, namely, the desecration

of the Temple by Bagoses, general of Artaxerxes Memnon. On account of the murder in the Temple of Bagoses' friend Jesus by John, who was high priest and brother of the murdered man, the Persian general entered into the Temple in defiance of Jewish prejudices, and punished the Jews by a heavy tribute, which was imposed upon them for seven years (Josephus, *Antiq.* xi. 7). The historical truth of that incident has been, however, of late much disputed.

Consequently there is no reference to the Book of Daniel during that period. The Book of Daniel naturally came into special notice in the Maccabean age, and during the great struggle against the efforts put forth by the Greek monarchs of Syria to destroy the Jewish faith and nation.

CHAPTER II

THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION AND THE WITNESS BORNE TO THE BOOK OF DANIEL IN PRE-CHRISTIAN AND APOSTOLIC TIMES

§ 1. *The Septuagint Version, especially that of Daniel*

THOSE critics who seek to overthrow the genuineness of the Book of Daniel endeavour to prove that the composition of that work must be assigned to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, about B.C. 164. The defenders of the authenticity of the book have, therefore, to show on the other side that the book cannot have been composed during the Maccabean era. It is therefore of importance to be able to show that there are works in existence, which belong to an earlier period, in which references are made to the Book of Daniel; and further, that there are books, probably composed during the Maccabean era, or shortly after, which contain facts which tend to prove that the Book of Daniel must, if fairly regarded, be assigned to an earlier period. It is also important to trace the influence which the Book of Daniel had over Jewish literature down to the first century of the Christian era.

Although the Septuagint translation of the Book of Daniel is not the earliest evidence which can be adduced, it is necessary, for obvious reasons, to refer in the very outset to that translation.

The Greek translation of the sacred writings of the Hebrews, commonly known as the Septuagint version, was made in Egypt, probably during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus (B.C. 283-247). The Pentateuch was the first portion of the Scriptures which was translated, and the translation for some time was probably confined to those five books. The other books included under the name of the Septuagint version were translated somewhat later. When the translation of the Pentateuch became popular among the Greek-speaking Jews in Egypt, a demand must have arisen for a similar translation of the other sacred writings. Hence it is likely that the translation of the Prophets and other books speedily followed in the wake of the Books of the Law.

The Greek translation of "the Law" appears to have been regarded at first with favour by the Jewish Sanhedrin. For the Palestinian Jews were at the time closely united by the ties of religion with their brethren in Egypt. The rival temple of Hierapolis with its priesthood had not yet been established, and the religious antipathy to the Greek language, literature, and customs exhibited later by the Palestinian Jews was not yet powerful. The early Greek version was probably termed "the Septuagint" because it was looked upon with favour, and possibly officially recognised, by the Jewish Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, which was composed of seventy persons. In later times, when the Jews of Palestine and Egypt became estranged from one another, and when the Greek version had become interwoven with the religious life of the Egyptian Jews, an attempt was made to claim Divine sanction for the Greek translation. The name "Septuagint" was then expounded as containing a reference to the number of the supposed translators, who, according

to the legend, were divinely assisted in their task. Those translators are said each to have produced a translation identical in phraseology, although they had been carefully secluded and shut off from intercourse with one another during the performance of the work.

The *Epistle of Aristeas* to Philocrates has given a kind of "fixity of tenure" to this legendary explanation of the name "Septuagint." That epistle was long considered destitute of all historical value, but scholars of the present day have shown that there is some historical truth mixed up with its legends, so that the epistle can no longer be considered worthless.¹ It was from that curious apocryphon that Josephus obtained his information concerning the origin of the LXX. version.² The dangers arising to the Jewish faith from the spread of the Greek ideas even in Palestine, however, soon became apparent. And when those evils manifested themselves in Palestine and Egypt, the orthodox Jews of Palestine learned to speak of the day on which the Septuagint appeared as a day as fatal to Israel as that on which the golden calf was made at Horeb.³

¹ See the important article of I. Abrahams in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for 1902, pp. 321 ff.

² See Prof. Swete's *Introd. to the Old Test. in Greek*, pp. 15-20, and the Appendix on the *Letter of Aristeas* by H. St J. Thackeray, M.A. (Cambridge, 1900).

³ See my *Koheleth*, or *Ecclesiastes*, p. 38, footnote, where the authorities are cited. The *Masechet Sopherim*, i. § 8, contains the statement. Dr M. Joel, *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte zu Anfang des zweiten christlichen Jahrhunderts* (1880), maintains that this antipathy against Greek writings dates from the period of the great rebellion under Trajan. Dr Joel Müller, however (*Masechet Sopherim*, p. 12), argues with greater probability that it dates back to the wars against the Greek monarchs of Syria. See Excursus I. at the end of the Commentary on *Koheleth*, p. 458.

The translation of the sacred books in the LXX. version which follow "the Five Books of Moses" is of unequal merit, and the translation of the Book of Daniel is, perhaps, the latest and the worst of the series. On all questions connected with the Septuagint, the great English scholar, Frederick Field, is justly regarded as one of the highest authorities, and his verdict condemnatory of the LXX. translation of that book has been to a large extent endorsed by the best modern scholars.¹ Field's opinion must not, however, be regarded as the final verdict of scholars.

Professor August Bludau, an able Roman Catholic critic, in his latest work, *Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Daniel* (1897), attaches more importance to the LXX. translation than any earlier scholar. Professor G. Jahn of Königsberg, a critic of the most advanced school, maintains (as in an earlier book on Esther²) that the LXX. translation exhibits on the whole an older text and one more correct in the main than the Massoretic. In his works on Esther and Daniel, Jahn has given a retranslation of the LXX. into Hebrew, with the object of establishing his novel hypothesis.³ Jahn, indeed, goes

¹ See the Prolegomena, cap. iv., to his edition of Origen's *Hexapla*, where, speaking of Theodotion's version and of the attempt of that translator to amend the LXX. version in order to bring it up "ad Hebraei archetypi normam," Field comments thus on the LXX. version of Daniel:—"Cujus versio LXX. viralis tam putide et praepostere jacet, ut nulla manu medica ad ecclesiae usus accommodari possit; unde accidit, ut, illa seposita et velut antiquata, Theodotionis editio in locum ejus successerit."

² *Das Buch Ester* nach der Septuaginta hergestellt, übersetzt und kritisch erklärt von G. Jahn, Professor in Königsberg. Buchhandlung, E. J. Brill: Leiden, 1901.

³ *Das Buch Daniel* nach der Septuaginta hergestellt, übersetzt und kritisch erklärt von G. Jahn, mit einem Anhang: Die Mescha Inschrift aufs neue untersucht. Leipzig: Verlag von Eduard Pfeiffer, 1904.

so far as to assert that Hebrew was the original language of the whole of Daniel, and that the LXX., in translating the portions which in the Massoretic text are in Aramaic, had a Hebrew text before them.¹

However inferior the LXX. version of the Book of Daniel may be, it is fortunate for Biblical studies that it has been preserved in the original Greek in the Chigi MS. That MS. was brought to light at Rome in 1772. The Syro-Hexaplar translation published in Milan, 1788, is an important voucher for the general correctness of the text set forth in the Chigi MS. The correctness of that MS. has also been borne witness to by its correspondence with the fragments of the LXX. translation preserved in the extant remains of the *Hexapla* of Origen, and by the quotations from the LXX. which occur in the writings of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Theodoret, Jerome, and other Church Fathers. The Chigi MS. was first published in Rome, 1772, in folio. It was edited by C. Segaar in 1775, afterwards by H. A. Hahn, with a comparison of the Syro-Hexaplar text (Lipsiæ, 1845), and still later by Joseph Cozza (Romæ, 1877). Earlier editions are noted by Hahn in his preface. It has been incorporated into Tischendorf's edition of the Septuagint (seventh edition,

¹ The attempt of Wellhausen to ignore Jahn's arguments in reference to the Book of Esther, as if the Königsberg professor was utterly ignorant about the subject on which he wrote, has been vigorously criticised by Jahn, and not without reason. Although we do not agree with Jahn's hypothesis, it is as worthy of scholarly examination as a large number of the hypotheses set forth by modern critics. It is certain that the LXX. translation of Daniel must be more critically examined in the future, and cannot be treated so lightly as Dr Pusey has done. Although the LXX. version of Daniel is considerably inferior to the Massoretic recension, there are several points in it worthy of careful consideration, even on matters of textual criticism.

with additions by E. Nestle, 1887), and is given in the third volume of Professor H. B. Swete's *Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*, edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press in 1894.¹

The LXX. version casts no little light upon several important questions connected with the age and interpretation of the Book of Daniel. It is the earliest attempt at an exposition of the book, and, having been written near to the Maccabean period, has peculiar value. For it seeks in many cases, notably in its translation of the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks (ch. ix. 25 ff.), to modify the text so as to give it the appearance of a prophecy concerning that period. It is strange that its value as the oldest interpretation has to a large extent been left out of sight. Its existence as an interpretation goes far to prove that the Book of Daniel itself, as a whole, must belong to an earlier period.

The LXX. translation of the book can scarcely have been executed later than B.C. 130. The Book of Daniel and the Greek translation of that work were well known at the time when the first Book of Maccabees was written.

§ 2. *The First Book of Maccabees*

According to the first Book of Maccabees, Mattathias on his deathbed reminded his sons of the noble acts and deliverances of their forefathers, in order to stir them up to contend faithfully and perseveringly for the faith which had been once for all delivered to them. Among the special deliverances alluded to in the speech of

¹ On Dr Salmon's remarks on the Chigi MS. and the LXX. translation as there represented, see *Crit. and Gramm. Comm.*, Appendix No. I.

Mattathias were two of the miraculous incidents recorded in the Book of Daniel: "Ananias, Azarias, and Misael having believed, were saved out of the flame";¹ "Daniel, for his innocence, was delivered from the mouth of lions" (1 Macc. ii. 59, 60).²

It may be too much to maintain, with Dr Pusey (pp. 372 ff.), that the allusions in Mattathias' speech are satisfactory evidence that the narratives of the Book of Daniel were well known and believed to be historical at the commencement of the Maccabean upheaval (B.C. 168). For trustworthy historians often put speeches of their own composition into the mouths of heroes whose exploits they may record with fidelity.³ The allusions are, however, incontestable evidence that the author of 1 Macc. was acquainted with the Book of Daniel, and believed in the historical character of its narratives.

Hengstenberg (whatever may be his merits or demerits as a critic) was correct in stating that the description of Alexander presented in 1 Macc. was based on the prophecies of Daniel. Although it is too much to affirm that the description is "almost a verbal transcript" from Daniel's book, the phraseology of the first Book of Maccabees, in recording events which occurred in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, proves the writer's acquaintance

¹ The expression here, *ἐσώθησαν ἐκ φλογός*, looks like a reminiscence of the LXX. For "the flame of the furnace" is not only mentioned in Dan. iii. 23, but also in verses 47 and 49.

² It is remarkable that these two deliverances are referred to in 3 Macc. vi. 6, 7, and in 4 Macc. xviii. 14, 15, where the father of the seven martyrs is said to have carefully instructed them in those very histories. No other of the miracles or wonders in the Book of Daniel are referred to in those books.

³ See the remarkable instance in the case of Tacitus noticed in my *Koheleth*, pp. 111-2.

not only with the Book of Daniel, but even with the Greek translation. Proofs of this statement will be found below.¹

The first Book of Maccabees must have been composed a considerable time before the annexation of Syria in B.C. 65 to the Roman dominions. The book must have been drawn up in Palestine shortly after the successes of the earlier Maccabees. It can scarcely have been composed later than the death of John Hyrkanus (1 Macc. xvi. 24), which took place in B.C. 106 or 105. Pusey has adduced reasons in favour of a much earlier

¹ The chief instances cited by Hengstenberg are the following :—
 (1) The LXX. translate the Hebrew of Dan. xi. 31, "*they shall pollute the sanctuary, even the fortress,*" by *καὶ μισοῦσι τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ φόβου*. In 1 Macc. i. 46 we read of Antiochus' orders, *μῆναί ἀγίασμα καὶ ἁγίου*. (2) In Dan. xi. 25 the LXX. relate how Antiochus marched against the king of Egypt with a numerous multitude (*ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου ἐν ὄχλῳ πολλῷ*). 1 Macc. states that "*he entered into Egypt with a heavy multitude*" (*εἰς Αἰγύπτου ἐν ὄχλῳ βαρεῖ*). (3) In Dan. xi. 26 the defeat of Ptolemy, king of Egypt, by Antiochus Epiphanes is spoken of, and the expression used of Ptolemy's soldiers, "*and many shall fall down slain.*" That phrase is rendered by the LXX., *καὶ πεσοῦνται τραυματαῖα πολλοί*. In 1 Macc. i. 18 the same battle is spoken of, and the phrase used, *καὶ ἔπεσον τραυματαῖα πολλοί*. (4) The employment in 1 Macc. i. 54 of the exact phrase, "*an abomination of desolation*" (*βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως*), used by the LXX. in Dan. xi. 31 in reference to the heathen altar erected upon the altar in the Temple of Jerusalem, is a clear proof of quotation from the LXX. version of that passage. In Dan. xii. 11 the phrase employed by the LXX. is *τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως*, while in Dan. ix. 27 the expression is *βδέλυγμα τῶν ἐρημώσεων*. Theodotion exactly follows the LXX. in the last-named passage, while in Dan. xii. 11 he uses *τὸ βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως* without the article, and in ch. xi. 31 renders *βδέλυγμα ἠφανισμένον*. The above four instances are fairly conclusive proofs of the use of the LXX. version of Daniel. The phraseology in 1 Macc. i. 19, 20 is evidently based on the language of Dan. xi. 28; and that employed in 1 Macc. i. 24 is based on Dan. xi. 36.

date, but they are not conclusive. The work appears to have been written originally in Aramaic or Hebrew, and afterwards translated into Greek. The Semitic original has been lost, and the existence of a Hebrew or Aramaic text has often been questioned. The Greek translation was probably made in Egypt, where a lively interest was taken in all matters affecting the Palestinian Jews. The allusion to Hyrkanus in the closing chapter may, however, have been added by the Greek translator, and in that case an earlier date must be assigned to the original work. But, as there is no clear evidence in favour of that conjecture, the first Book of Maccabees cannot with certainty be maintained to be earlier than B.C. 100. The use, however, which the writer has made of the Book of Daniel, and the fact that several phrases are taken from the LXX. translation, scarcely harmonise with the confident statements of modern critics that the Book of Daniel is not older than B.C. 161.

The sympathies of the writer of 1 Maccabees appear to have been more disposed towards Sadduceeism than Pharisaism. The writer considered it wise in general to keep aloof from the religious controversies of his day. Geiger has, however, adduced a number of passages in which 1 Maccabees exhibits Sadducean leanings. The book contains no reference to angels or spirits; it makes no distinct mention of a life beyond the grave, and it does not utter a word concerning the resurrection. The names of God and Lord occur, indeed, on the pages of the book; if it be examined only in the old Vulgate version, or in the English Authorised or Revised Versions. But scholars are fully aware that an examination of the Greek texts in various MSS. leads to a different conclusion. In all the passages where

God or Lord would naturally occur, mention is made only of "Heaven's" help, or a personal pronoun is employed as a substitute for the distinct mention of the sacred name. It may be wrong to interpret such a fact as necessarily indicative of a leaning towards scepticism. The first Book of the Maccabees, like the Book of Esther, is imbued with the conviction that "there is a God that judgeth the earth," and that God was the God of Israel. The object which the writer had in view in avoiding mention of the sacred name may have been simply a feeling of reverence, or he may have hoped thereby to render his narrative more palatable to Gentile readers, if the writer be the Greek translator as well as the author of the original work. He exhibits throughout the book a close acquaintance with the sacred writings of his nation, and is ever ready to acknowledge their unique character as books of paramount authority. He also not infrequently alludes to the marvellous acts recorded in their pages. But, on the other hand, he has dropped no word of censure upon the high-handed manner in which the Maccabee chieftains, for political reasons, set aside the enactments of the Jewish law; and there is no reference in the book to "the Messianic hope" with which the great Hebrew prophets were wont to console the faithful in Israel in days of darkness and gloom similar to those which are recorded in the Book of Maccabees. It is easy to read between the lines of the history the dislike he entertained for the uncompromising Puritans of the period, who are termed in his pages "Assidæans," or "the pious," whether that name be viewed as the proper appellation or merely as the nickname of the party.

It was therefore natural for a writer with such views to look upon Daniel's prophecy as accomplished in the

events the details of which he has recorded. The adoption in his book, in its Greek form (the only form in which the book is extant), of the phraseology found in the LXX. version tends to show that he agreed with the view taken in that version. If the Hebrew text of 1 Maccabees were before us, there might be indications to show that the Hebrew writer interpreted the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks similarly to the Greek paraphrast of Daniel. It may, however, fairly be maintained that in 1 Maccabees an interesting illustration is afforded of the readiness of Biblical expositors on very insufficient data to trace in the ancient prophets the events of their own days—a disposition which has become common among many earnest people in Christian times, from the days of the Apostles even down to our own days.

§ 3. *The Third Book of the Sibyllines*

The third Book of the Sibylline Oracles exhibits the firm hold which the Book of Daniel had of the Jewish nation at a period shortly after the Maccabean era. The writers of those Greek verses were well acquainted with the Book of Daniel. It may indeed be affirmed that all the information which those Greek versifiers had of the Hebrew prophets was derived through the medium of the LXX. translation. The third Book of the Sibyllines is a conglomerate of Greek hexameter verses, put together to some extent at hap-hazard. There is in it an evident absence of sequence of thought. Many of the verses do not belong to the connection in which they are found, and are diverse both in the date of their composition and in their subject-matter from those with which they are externally connected. The book, as it has come down

to us, contains copious references to the Biblical histories, and includes also not a few to the Messianic hope. Portions of it reproduce narratives of the Pentateuch, interwoven with Greek mythology in order to arrest the attention of Gentile readers. Other portions re-echo the language of Isaiah and Ezekiel, of Zechariah and Daniel, and of other prophets. The book forms one of that interesting series of works which Schürer has well designated as "Jewish propaganda under heathen masks."¹

The opening of that book of the Sibyllines may be conveniently divided into two unconnected portions. Verses 1-35 have no bearing on our subject, while verses 36-96 date probably from B.C. 40-30. The following lines are noteworthy, as indicative of Messianic hopes in a "dark and cloudy day":—

"But when Rome shall also rule over Egypt,
 Ruling it with one object, then shall the greatest kingdom
 Of the immortal king appear among men.
 Then shall come a holy king swaying the sceptre of all the earth
 For all ages of time hastening on.
 And then shall implacable wrath (come) upon Latin men.
 Three shall devastate Rome with piteous fate.
 All men shall perish in their own houses,
 When from heaven the fiery cataract shall pour down.
 Ah me! wretched! when that day shall come,
 And the judgment of the immortal God, the great King."
 (Verses 46-56.)

Rome was evidently regarded by the Sibyl as the last world-power before the appearance among men of the Messianic kingdom. The lines were evidently composed during the troubles of the triumvirate at Rome of Antony, Octavianus, and Lepidus; for in the context (verses 75-80) Cleopatra is alluded to as the "widow"

¹ Schürer, *Gesch. des jüdischen Volkes*, ii. p. 789.

ruler of Egypt. Ver. 54 is plainly based on Dan. vii. 9, 10. The confusion in which the Roman earth was then involved was regarded as introducing the final day of doom. In connection with such an anticipation of the judgment of the world, a prediction follows (ver. 63 ff.) of the coming of Beliar or Belial.¹

In several of the lines at the close of this fragment distinct imitations of Isaiah may be traced, while verses 89-92 appear to be founded to some extent upon Zech. xiv. 6-8.

The opening of the second fragment of book iii., which begins at ver. 97 and extends to ver. 294 inclusive, has been lost. It is, however, probable that a portion of the passage has been partially preserved in the two fragments quoted in the second century by Theophilus (*Ad Autolyicum*, lib. ii. cap. 36), which are evidently the production of an Egyptian Jew. Those fragments contain verses quoted by the Jewish writer Alexander Polyhistor, who, captured in war, was brought to Rome as a slave in the days of L. Sulla, and afterwards became a historian of repute.² Josephus also quotes this "oracle," which he probably borrowed without acknowledgment from the pages of Polyhistor.³ The opening fragments, containing 84 lines, are given in Friedlieb's edition, pp. 2-7, and have been

¹ In discussing the date of the composition of these verses, Schürer is probably correct in regarding two lines as interpolations, namely, the second half of ver. 61 with ver. 62, and the first half of ver. 63 as far as the word *Βελίαρ*. Those lines contain a reference to Sebaste, or Samaria, which led Frankel to assign B.C. 25 as the date of the composition of this portion of the Sibyllines.

² See Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, "Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer u. samar. Geschichtswerke." Breslau, 1875.

³ Josephus, *Antiq.*, i. 4. § 3.

translated by Professor Blass in Professor Kautzsch's important work, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alt. Test.* (2 vols. 1900), Band ii. pp. 184-5.

In the earlier verses of these latter fragments references are made to the creation of the world and of the human race. The writer, who derives his information from the Book of Genesis, notices the position in which man was placed above the other animal creation. His verses are remarkable for their sharp polemic against idolatry. They speak of the fire which will consume the idolater, and of the life which those who fear God will enjoy in Paradise, where they banquet on sweet bread from the starry heaven. Some lines have no doubt been lost, for book iii. 97-161 gives an account of the building of the Tower of Babel and the confusion of languages, after which the Greek legends of the division of the earth between Saturn and Titan and Japetus, and the overthrow of the Titans, are set forth with divers modifications. The portion closes with a curious description of the world-kingdoms (verses 158-161), namely, the kingdom of Egypt, followed by that of the Persians, Medes, and Ethiopians, of Assyria, Babylon, and of the Macedonians, again of Egypt, then of Rome. The writer speaks from an Egyptian standpoint, and hence the history of those nations seems to him to comprise "the times of the Gentiles." A short reference is made to the kingdom of Solomon (verses 167-170), after which the Sibyl proceeds to describe the Greek or Macedonian kingdom (verses 171-174):—

"But when Greeks are overbearing and impure,
Another nation of Macedonia, great, mixed, shall rule;
They will bring a fearful cloud of war on mortals,
But the heavenly God shall utterly sweep it away."

The Roman kingdom is next described. The opening of the description is :—

“ But thereafter shall be the beginning of another Kingdom,
 White, and many-headed, and from the western sea,
 Which shall rule a large territory, and make many totter,
 And shall later cause terror to all kings,
 And shall sweep away much gold and silver from many cities.”
 (Verses 175–180.)

The epithet “ white ” has reference to the white toga worn by the Roman *candidati*, or aspirants for civil offices. The appellation “ many-headed ” probably refers to the Roman republican and democratic constitution. The misery caused at Rome by luxury, gross immorality and hate, is described as lasting (verses 192–195)

“ Up to the seventh kingdom over which shall rule
 A king of Egypt who shall be of the race of the Greeks.
 And then shall the nation of the great God again be strong,
 Who shall be to all mortals guides of life.”

The king of Egypt here noticed is Ptolemy VII., Physcon, who reigned in conjunction with his brother, Ptolemy VI., Philometor (B.C. 170–164), and was for a while driven from the throne, which he regained after the death of his brother. He reigned as sole monarch of Egypt from B.C. 145 to 117. The verses seem to have been composed probably during the later period of Ptolemy's reign, when the Maccabean princes had firmly established the independence of the Jewish state.¹ The Sibyl had lofty anticipations of “ the nation of the great God,” for she proceeds to prophesy the overthrow of the Titans, the downfall of Troy, and the overthrow of various kingdoms, and then pictures (ver. 213 ff.) the

¹ Friedlieb assigns these verses to the year B.C. 160; Alexandre, to B.C. 168; Ewald prefers B.C. 124; Hilgenfeld and Schürer, B.C. 140.

Jewish state as consisting of pious men who oppose idolatry and superstition. A glowing description follows of the Jewish character and of their laws. In her description the Sibyl mentions the history of Moses, the departure from Egypt, the giving of the Law, and the building of the Temple. Fate, however, said the prophetess, would at last drive them (the Jews) from their land because of their idolatries (verses 280-294) :—

“ Because of which during seven decades of times the fruitful land
Shall be desolate for thee, and the wonders of the temple.

. . . . But continue thou

Believing in the holy laws of the great God,
When He shall lift up thy wearied knee straight to the light.
And then, indeed, will God from heaven send a king,
Who will judge every man in blood and gleam of fire.
For there is a certain royal stem whose race shall be
Without failing. And this [race] in revolving years
Shall rule, and shall begin to rear a new temple of God.
And all the kings of the Persians shall give assistance,
With gold, and brass, and well-worked iron.
For God Himself shall grant at night the holy dream,
And then shall the Sanctuary be again as it was before.”

The thoughts here expressed are derived from the writings of Jeremiah, Isaiah, Haggai, Daniel (especially in verses 286, 287), and Zechariah. Jeremiah's “seventy years” are plainly mentioned, and subsequent lines could be quoted which strangely anticipate expressions of the New Testament Apocalypse. The phraseology and thought of that New Testament book are so largely derived from the writings of the old Hebrew prophets that a modern scholar has ventured to assert that it is only an old Jewish apocalypse interwoven with thoughts of a Christian writer.¹

¹ See *Die Offenbarung Johannis als eine jüdische Apokalypse in christlicher Bearbeitung nachgewiesen* von Eberhard Vischer, mit einem Nachwort von Adolf Harnack. In O. von Gebhardt und

The third Book of the Sibyllines contains other plain references to the Book of Daniel. One of the most remarkable is that contained in verses 381-400:—

“But Macedonia will bring forth a heavy woe for Asia, and from Europe will shoot up a great grief from the bastard race of the Kronidæ¹ and from a generation of slaves.

“She (Macedonia) will subdue the fortified city of Babylon, and called Mistress of all the earth, wherever the sun doth shine, shall be destroyed with evil destinies, not having law for late-born, much-wandering (men).

“There will come even once, unexpectedly,² to the happy land of Asia, a man with shoulders covered with purple mantle, wild, perverting justice (*ἀλλοδίκης*), fiery. For a thunderbolt before aroused him to light.³ His evil yoke all Asia shall bear, and moistened earth shall drink in much slaughter.

“But thus, too, Hades shall attend on everyone, all-renowned.⁴ The race of those whom he himself would destroy. Even through their race shall his race be destroyed; producing, indeed, one root, which also (Death) the murderer-of-mortals shall cut down out of ten horns; but shall plant hard by another plant. And he shall cut down the warrior sire of purple race, and he himself shall perish by sons⁵ . . . and then shall the horn planted hard by bear rule.”

The reference in this passage, corrupted though the text may be, to the Book of Daniel is unmistakable;

A. Harnacks *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, Band ii., 1886. The best answer to all such attacks on the New Testament books is to be derived from a careful observation of the numerous quotations in those books from the Old Testament literature.

¹ Read with Ewald *Κρονίδων* in place of *Κρονίδαο*. The person alluded to is Alexander the Great, who allowed himself to be called the son of Jupiter Ammon.

² *ἀπιστ'*; Ewald conjectures *ἄπιστ'*, *faithlessly*.

³ Ewald thinks that there is an allusion in this line to Seleucus Keraunos, one of the predecessors of Antiochus Epiphanes.

⁴ Ewald reads *πανεύιστον*, which is found in one MS., for *παναίστον*, *all-destroying*, considering the reference to be to Antiochus IV.'s surname of *Epiphanes*. The passage is corrupt.

⁵ The text is corrupt, even though *Ἄρης* be read for *ἄρης*.

however strange and confusing also may be the interpretation of the prophecy. The Sibyl's account of the events subsequent to the death of Antiochus Epiphanes will be noticed elsewhere. The versifier was acquainted with the Book of Daniel, and the writer, concealed under the assumed garb of the Sibyl prophetess, may even have been acquainted with the LXX. translation of the prophet.

If it could be distinctly proved that such verses were composed B.C. 160, the modern contention that the Book of Daniel was composed about that date would fall to the ground. But though we may not be able to go so far, even the later dates assigned to the Sibyllines do not harmonise with the modern theory of the composition of Daniel. For those allusions, combined with others which point in the same direction, are irreconcilable with the date B.C. 164, to which modern critics assign the Book of Daniel. We may be compelled to accept certain conclusions of the modern critics deduced from the phenomena of chap. xi. But there is another hypothesis by which the phenomena of that chapter may be more satisfactorily explained, and its unique character recognised.

§ 4. *The Book of Ben Sira*

The Book of Ecclesiasticus, or The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, or Ben Sira, affords distinct evidence that the LXX. version was in use in the time of that writer, and probably at a much earlier date. Accepting, provisionally at least, the general conclusion at which critics have arrived as to the date of the work, namely, B.C. 120, Jesus, the grandfather of Ben Sira, who is mentioned in the prologue of the book, cannot have lived much later than B.C. 170. Ben Sira's grandfather

was apparently acquainted with the Sacred Scriptures in the triple division given to them by the Jews. Ben Sira asserts that his grandsire gave himself much "to the reading of the Law, and the Prophets, and the other books of our fathers." He apologises thus for his own translation of his grandfather's sayings:—"Ye are entreated, therefore, to read with favour and attention, and to pardon us, if in any parts of what we have laboured to interpret we may seem to fail in some of the phrases. For things originally spoken in Hebrew have not the same force in them, when they are translated into another tongue; and not only these, but the Law itself, and the Prophecies, and the Rest of the books, have no small difference when they are spoken in their original language."

This passage in the Book of Ecclesiasticus is the earliest mention of a canon of Holy Scripture. It alludes to the translation of the recognised canonical books into Greek. And inasmuch as there are admitted references to the Book of Daniel of earlier date than B.C. 120, the passage in the prologue of the Book of Ecclesiasticus might be fairly taken to imply that a Greek translation of the Book of Daniel was known to Ben Sira.

In opposition to that conclusion, stress has been laid by modern critics on the absence of any allusion to Daniel in the Book of Ecclesiasticus in the chapters at the close which in the Greek bear the heading *Hymn of Fathers* (πατέρων ὕμνος, xliv. 1). It has been urged that the omission proves the Book of Daniel to have been unknown to Jesus the son of Sirach. In reply to that objection, attention has often been called to Ben Sira's omission in that list of worthies of Ezra, "the second Moses," as Ezra was termed by the later Jews. The

catalogue, moreover, of the great men of Israel given in those six long chapters is far from complete. Joshua, the son of Josedek, is there mentioned along with Zerubbabel. Nehemiah is praised, and Ezra completely omitted. The omissions in such a list prove nothing. The list opens with Enoch and Noah (ch. xlv.), and after recording names down to Nehemiah (xlix. 13), turns back again to Enoch and relates a second time his translation. It then speaks of Joseph, Shem, Seth, and Adam, and hurries on at once to "Simon, the son of Onias, the high priest," whose praises fill the greater portion of ch. l.

The argument derived from the silence of Ben Sira was of importance so long as critics were wont to maintain that the date of the work of Jesus the son of Sirach was about B.C. 200-180. That date has not, indeed, been satisfactorily disproved. But the case is, however, altered if, as scholars now generally maintain, the book be regarded as issued in its present form somewhere about B.C. 120. For, as has been noted, works prior to B.C. 120 do contain distinct reference to the Book of Daniel.

Ben Sira (ch. xvii. 14 ; Eng. ver., xvii. 17) says that God appoints over every Gentile nation a ruler, but reserves Israel for His own special portion. That passage has been explained to refer to angelic rulers set over the world and its nations. Some modern critics consider that the idea in Daniel x. 13 has been borrowed from Ben Sira. That hypothesis would assign too late a date to the Book of Daniel.

Professor D. S. Margoliouth¹ has pointed out a probable quotation from Daniel (ch. ii. 21) in Sirach

¹ See the chapter on "The Argument from Silence" in Prof. Margoliouth's *Lines of Defence of the Biblical Revelation* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1900), p. 176 ff.

xxxiii. 8 (or ch. xxxvi. in some editions of the LXX.), where God is spoken of as "changing times and feasts," or, probably, "times and seasons." The Book of Daniel speaks of "changing the times and seasons" as a Divine attribute (ch. ii. 21), and "changing times and laws" by man as impiety against heaven (ch. vii. 25). There is an under reference in those statements to Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who sought to change the times and the Law (1 Kings xii. 31-33).

In Sirach xlix. 9 we read: Ezekiel "remembered the enemies in storm, and to do good to them that directed their ways aright" (R.V.). The Syriac and the Arabic versions in the first clause of that passage read "*Job*" in place of "*the enemies.*" The word in Hebrew for *Job* is scarcely distinguishable from that for *enemies*. Geiger and Arnald maintain "*Job*" to be the true reading, and Professor Margoliouth has arrived independently at the same conclusion.¹ Margoliouth considers Ben Sira to refer to the passages in Ezekiel where "Noah, Daniel, and Job" are mentioned, and translates thus: "He (Ezekiel) also mentioned Job by a hint, and declared happy those who walk straight," or uprightly (Sirach xlix. 9).

The correctness of Professor Margoliouth's alteration of Sirach's text from "*in storm,*" or "*in a storm,*" into "*by a hint,*" is not material to the present argument. But, by a comparison of the note of the LXX. translators at the end of the Book of Job (last chapter, ver. 18, or 17 in Swete), Professor Margoliouth shows that the passage in Sirach contains also a reference to Daniel (ch. xii.). The LXX.

¹ See O. F. Fritzsche, *Die Weisheit Jesus-Sirachs* in Kurzgef. exeg. Handbuch z. den Apokryphen. So also Ryssel, in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen des A. T.*, vol. i., who translates from the newly discovered Hebrew text, which reads *Job* instead of "enemies."

translators say: "It is written that he (Job) shall rise up again with those whom the Lord raises." Dan. xii. 13 records the announcement to Daniel that he would, in the resurrection (predicted in ver. 2), "stand in his lot at the end of the days." In other words, Ben Sira affirms that, in the resurrection, Daniel will stand in his lot with those who, like Noah and Job, have walked uprightly. No positive argument can, indeed, be derived from the most brilliant conjectural emendation. Consequently the point is not to be pressed too far. The argument from the silence of the Book of Ben Sira has, however, been made too much of by critics, and, if the latest opinion as to the date of Ben Sira's work be correct, is in itself of no real value.

§ 5. *The Enoch Literature*

The Book of Enoch has been more or less a subject of interest to scholars ever since a copy of the Ethiopic translation was first brought to Europe from Abyssinia by the traveller Bruce. A considerable collection of Ethiopic MSS. was captured by the British at Magdala during the Abyssinian war of 1867-8, and afterwards deposited in the British Museum. Those MSS., carefully catalogued by the late lamented Dr Wm. Wright, Professor of Arabic at Cambridge, afforded the materials for the construction of a better text than that edited by Professor, afterwards Archbishop, Lawrence (third edition, 1838). Professor Dillmann published, in 1851, a better text than that of Lawrence, as being based on five MSS. It is still, perhaps, the best Ethiopic text yet published.¹

¹ A new Ethiopic text has been edited by J. Flemming, 1902. The same scholar edited in 1901, along with L. Radermacher, the remains of the Greek version.

A German translation and commentary followed in 1853. Rev. R. H. Charles, D.D., Professor of Biblical Greek, Trinity College, Dublin, published an English translation of the book, in which he has amended and revised the Ethiopic text by a careful collation of the Ethiopic MSS. in the British Museum which have been acquired since the date of Dillmann's work. Professor Charles used also for his work the newly discovered Greek text of a large portion of the book, found at Akhmin, in Egypt, in 1886-7. On the latter discovery Dillmann communicated an important paper to the Royal Prussian Academy of Sciences in Berlin (December 15, 1892).

The Book of Enoch is a composite production of 108 chapters, many of them being very short. It is a collection of the "remains" of an apocryphal literature connected with the name of the ancient patriarch, comprising visions and similitudes, interspersed with narratives of the days of Noah and of the loves of the angels. Portions of the book, as it now exists, are distinctly fragmentary in their character.

Leaving out of sight the concluding four chapters (cv.-cviii.), the remaining portion may be divided into three large sections, in each of which smaller fragments are embedded, more or less closely connected with their contexts. The three parts are: (1) chs. i.-xxxvi., together with lxxxiii.-civ., introductory, with visions and dreams; (2) *Similitudes*, chs. xxxvii.-lxxi; (3) chs. lxxii.-lxxxii., which may be styled, with Charles, the "Book of Celestial Physics." This last portion contains nothing which has reference to the Book of Daniel. The first portion is subdivided by Professor Charles into three parts: (a) i.-xxxvi., which cannot be later than B.C. 161, and probably are as early as B.C. 170; (b) lxxxiii.-xc., which clearly

belong to the Maccabean era ; (c) xci.—civ., B.C. 104–95. Scholars for the most part assign the largest and most important portions of the book to the middle of the second century before Christ. Those portions show traces of an intimate acquaintance on the part of their authors with the Book of Daniel. The original language of the Book of Enoch was either Hebrew, or, though less likely, Aramaic. The Ethiopic text is a translation from a Greek translation. The smaller Greek fragments of Syncellus, with the larger and more important Greek fragment lately discovered, which includes thirty-two chapters of the first part of the work, appear to be more or less corrupt texts of the original Greek translation.

Among the numerous allusions contained in the Book of Enoch to the Book of Daniel are the following :—

The Messiah is described in the *Similitudes* as “the Son of man” (Dan. vii.), and the angels are often spoken of as “the holy watchers” (Dan. iv.). The angelology of Daniel is adopted throughout, but with large additions. More interesting, perhaps, is the imitation of the description in Dan. vii. of the Ancient of days, the hair of whose head was like pure wool, whose throne was like the flaming fire, before whom issued a fiery stream, and to whom ten thousand times ten thousand ministered (Enoch xiv. 18–22, xl. 1, lxi. 10, xc. 20, and in other places). The circumstance of “the judgment being set and the books opened” also occurs in the Book of Enoch (xlvii. 3). The description of Daniel’s trembling with loins relaxed (Dan. viii., ix., x., xii.), and his falling on his face on beholding the celestial appearances, reappears in Enoch xiv. 14, lx. 3, 4. The description given in several passages of Dan. xi. of Palestine as “the pleasant and glorious land,” reappears in the Book of

Enoch lxxxix. 40, xc. 20, in the Maccabean portion. Daniel's statement, in his account of Belshazzar's banquet, "weighed in the balances and found wanting," is imitated in Enoch xl. 1, where the patriarch describes himself as having seen all the secrets of heaven, and having learned "how the kingdom is divided, and how the actions of men are weighed upon the balance."

As the Greek version of the Book of Enoch was executed from a Hebrew original, one could not expect to find in that translation any direct traces of the LXX. translation of Daniel.

The relations in which the Maccabean leaders stood to the Chasidim or Pharisaic party at different times are faithfully reflected in the various parts of the Book of Enoch. Dr Charles has pointed out that, in the portion which belongs to the period during which the Maccabees stood high in popular esteem (chs. lxxxiii.—xc.), the Maccabees are depicted as the leaders of the righteous, and their efforts are spoken of as destined to result in the setting up of the Messianic kingdom. In the later portion (chs. xci.—civ.) the Maccabees are viewed from a more unfavourable standpoint, although not even then regarded as openly hostile to the righteous. In the *Similitudes* (chs. xxxvii.—lxxi.), which form the middle portion of the book as it has come down to modern times, the Maccabean princes are described as enemies of truth and righteousness, who persecute the righteous even to death.

In the oldest part of the Book of Enoch, namely, that consisting of chs. i.—xxxvi., assigned by Charles to B.C. 170, the expression "*watchers*" is employed for angels (comp. Dan. iv. 13, 17, 23), and generally for fallen angels (see, however, ch. xii. 3, xiv. 1). The thousands of holy ones remind of Dan. vii. 10. The "lofty

throne" of God in ch. xiv. 18, and the streams of flaming fire flowing forth from beneath that throne, recall Dan. vii. 9, 10. Michael, one of the holy angels, is spoken of as the guardian of Israel (comp. Dan. x. 13, 21, xii. 1). The description of the tree of life in ch. xxiv. reminds of the tree in the vision of Dan. iv. The resurrection of the righteous and the wicked is a reminiscence of Dan. xii. 1, 2. The angelology of Enoch, however, is more highly developed than that of Daniel, which proves that the latter book was the earlier.

The *Dream Visions* contained in chs. lxxxiii.–xc. are assigned by Charles to a period not later than B.C. 161. Under the similitude of oxen and cows and sheep, with their enemies, wolves, lions, tigers, dogs, eagles, kites, etc., are depicted divers histories of the Old Testament. Seventy shepherds, probably angel-guards, are represented as set over Israel. The four great kingdoms of Daniel are referred to, but in a confused manner (ch. lxxxix.). The name "pleasant and glorious land" (ch. lxxxix. 40, xc. 20) is borrowed from Daniel (xi. 41). The throne of God is set up, there is a reference to judgment books sealed and opened (ch. xc. 20). References are made to the efforts put forth by the Chasidim, or "the pious," to reform matters in Israel (see the important notes of Charles on ch. xc., pp. 247–253). The symbols of "horns" and a "great horn" are used, not of world-powers, but in reference to the Maccabee leaders. No mention is made of the horrors of the later times of Antiochus Epiphanes, and hence, perhaps, it may be inferred that this portion of the Book of Enoch was composed earlier than those times.

Chs. xci.–civ. belong probably to a later period. The state of parties described is no longer pre-Maccabean or

early Maccabean. The writer was evidently a Pharisee, and denounces those who have forsaken the Law and murdered the righteous. Professor Charles assigns those chapters to B.C. 104-95. The acquaintance of the writer with the Book of Daniel is manifest. There is an Apocalypse of "weeks," where the Messianic period is spoken of. There is a distinct declension in the theology of the writer when compared with that of Daniel. The Messianic kingdom seems to be regarded as merely temporary. The righteous seem to be the only persons who attain to resurrection. The wicked descend into Sheol, and abide there in pain for ever.

In the portion of *Similitudes* consisting of chs. xxxvii.-lxxi., another phase is presented. This portion seems not later than B.C. 95. It may be as late as B.C. 64. The whole portion is full of allusions to Daniel. The "watchers" reappear, but are there exclusively fallen angels. There is a cry for vengeance from the suffering righteous: "the blood of the righteous ascends from the earth before the Lord of spirits." Dan. vii. and its imagery are distinctly alluded to (ch. xlvii.). The Messiah is repeatedly presented as "the Elect One." The Ancient of days is "the Head of days" (ch. xlvi. 1, lv. 1, lx. 1, etc.). "Angels of punishment," or torturing angels, here come under observation. The trembling and weakness which seized Enoch at the sight of the Head of days is a description borrowed from Dan. viii. 17, x. 7, 10. So also in ch. lxxi. The fables of Leviathan and Behemoth are alluded to (ch. lx. 7, 8). "The Son of man sitting on the throne of His glory" is spoken of (ch. lxii. 5). In the after chapters the name "Son of man" is not frequently made use of. Curious anticipations of New Testament language occur in several places,

and a vivid description is given in other places of Gehenna and its torments.

§ 6. *Allusions to Daniel in the Books of Judith and Tobit*

The Book of Daniel is referred to in a large number of the early Apocrypha. The description of Judith's care to avoid partaking of the wines and meats offered her by Holofernes appears to be founded upon the language of the narrative which records the similar conduct of Daniel (Dan. i. 8 ff.). That narrative is also alluded to in the account of Tobit's description of his own abstinence from eating the bread of the Gentiles (Tob. i. 10-12). Moreover, in the latter book, the account of Sara's going up to an upper chamber and praying towards the window (or hole in the wall) towards Jerusalem (Tob. iii. 11), has its counterpart in the account of Daniel's going up to his house and praying with his windows open towards Jerusalem (Dan. vi. 10).

The Book of Tobit was written about a century before Christ. The Book of Judith has by critics been assigned to a date not much later than the era of the Maccabees, probably about B.C. 130. Other critics, however, believe that book to be later, and Volkmar assigns it to the time of Trajan. G. Klein considers it was written in the time of Hadrian; but the reasons assigned are worse than fanciful. The early reference made to its story which occurs in the Epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians (ch. lv.) is sufficient to refute those theories.

§ 7. *The Baruch Literature*

The Book of Baruch also contains references to Daniel. That book is a conflate production of three authors. The

so-called Epistle of Jeremy at its close has no connection with the chapters which precede it, while the earlier portion of the book (as presented in the Greek translation) is evidently the work of two distinct writers. Kneucker regards those portions as the work of two different translators, both translating from a Hebrew original. The portion, chs. i.—iii. 8, was probably composed originally in Hebrew; but whether the second portion be a translation from a Hebrew or Aramaic original is a matter of considerable doubt. The question is whether the earlier part goes back to Maccabean times, or was composed subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. The reasons assigned by Schürer and others for the latter hypothesis are not conclusive, and on the whole the earlier date appears more probable. No satisfactory argument, however, can be based upon a point which is still a subject of lively discussion between able critics.

The first portion of the Book of Baruch contains several quotations from the Book of Daniel, and hence, whatever may be the date of the work, it is a matter of interest to notice the relation in which those quotations stand to the LXX. version.

Ewald long ago observed (in his *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 2, p. 233) that the citations from the Pentateuch in Baruch (Bar. ii. 2, 3, 28–35) are “very free, and are not made from the LXX.” Kneucker, in his *Kritik und Erklärung of Das Buch Baruch*, has pointed out that the Greek translations from the Book of Daniel, in the passages referred to, coincide more closely with the original text than do the versions of either the LXX. or Theodotion. The numerous quotations, however, made in the Book of Baruch from Jeremiah strangely

correspond with the text of the LXX. In spite, therefore, of the proofs that the Greek translator of Baruch has often translated Jeremiah directly from the Hebrew original, it is impossible to resist the conviction that the translator also made use of the LXX. translation.

The original author of the first portion of the Book of Baruch made an extensive use of Daniel's prayer recorded in Dan. ix. The Greek translator (as is evident from the manner in which he has dealt with the quotations from Jeremiah) was able to avail himself of the Hebrew portion of Daniel, and would, therefore, naturally be more inclined to translate directly from the original than to avail himself of such an unsafe and arbitrary translation of Daniel as that which was incorporated into the Alexandrine version of the Scriptures. It is unnecessary to point out that Belshazzar, under the name of Baltasar, is referred to as the living son of Nebuchadnezzar, ch. i. 11, 12.

In connection with the literature which has gathered round the name of Baruch, one may, perhaps, call attention to the work known as the *Apocalypse of Baruch*. The latter work is entirely distinct from the apocryphal *Book of Baruch* contained in the LXX. version. Some similarity of thought may be traced, but the books are in the main independent. The *Apocalypse of Baruch* has recently been edited by Professor R. H. Charles, and is worthy of careful study.¹ The work may belong to the second half of the Christian era, and is peculiarly interesting. It appears to have been composed by

¹ *The Apocalypse of Baruch, translated from the Syriac*, chaps. i.–lxxviii., from the sixth century MS. in the Ambrosian Library of Milan; and chaps. lxxviii.–lxxxvii., the Epistle of Baruch, from a new and critical text based on ten MSS. and published herewith. Edited, with introduction, notes and indices, by R. H. Charles. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1896.

Pharisaic Jews, and contains, more or less, attacks on Christianity, and so, though preserved by Christians, was ultimately allowed to drop out of notice. It contains, however, an interesting reference to "Messiah the Prince" in chs. xxix. 3, xxxix. 7, and that phraseology is probably taken from Dan. ix. 25. The book also refers to Daniel's four kingdoms in ch. xxxix. 4, 5. References are to be found in it to 4 Esdras. It is also interesting as being probably the source from which Papias derived his strange story of the growth of corn and wine in the Millennium; and as Papias was a pupil of St John, such a fact tends to show the antiquity of the book.

§ 8. *Josephus*

The LXX. version of the Book of Daniel was known to and employed by the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus. Josephus, indeed, claims to have translated directly from the original Book of Daniel. For he says (*Antiq. Jud.* lib. x. cap. x. 6), "Let no one blame me for thus writing down each of these things according to the writing as I find it in the ancient books. For even straightway in the beginning of the history, I stated to those who would examine into any of the matters, or were disposed to blame, that I was only paraphrasing the books of the Hebrews (*μόνον τε μεταφράζειν τὰς Ἑβραίων βίβλους*), translating them into the Greek tongue (*εἰπὼν εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα γλῶτταν*)."

Notwithstanding that statement, which need not be called in question, and of whose truth, if necessary, satisfactory proofs might be adduced, there is evidence to show that Josephus constantly employed the LXX.

version of the Book of Daniel, as well as the LXX. version of the other books.¹

Interpretations of several of the prophecies of Daniel are to be found in the writings of Josephus. In *Antiq.* x. 10. 4 the dream of the colossus is explained, although, from prudential reasons, he takes care not to explain what is meant by "the stone" which broke at last the image to pieces. The vision of the ram and the he-goat is explained in a fairly satisfactory manner of the sufferings endured during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, in *Antiq.* x. 11. 6, at the end. He states there that Daniel also wrote concerning the empire of the Romans (*περὶ τῆς τῶν Ρωμαίων ἡγεμονίας*), and that Palestine would be wasted by them. This is a reference not only to Dan. vii., but more especially to the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks (ch. ix.), which again seems referred to as "an ambiguous oracle" in *De Bello Jud.* vi. 5. 4 (see our remarks on the Seventy Weeks).

¹ In Dan. i. 12, 16, where Daniel asks to be fed *with vegetables*, the LXX. render τὰ ὄσπρια. Josephus, in his version of the story, has ὄσπρια καὶ φοίνικας. Theodotion has employed in the two passages the word σπέσματα.

In ch. v. 7, where Theodotion has καὶ τρίτος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου ἄρξει, the LXX. have καὶ δοθήσεται αὐτῷ ἐξουσία τοῦ τρίτου μέρους τῆς βασιλείας. Josephus writes that the king promised to give τὸ τρίτον τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀρχῆς μέρος (*Antiq.* x. 11. 3). In ch. vi. 20 the LXX. render the speech of Darius at the den of lions, "O Daniel, if indeed thou livest (εἰ ἄρα ζῆς), and thy God, whom thou servest continually, has saved thee from the lions," etc. Josephus, similarly, in his paraphrase, speaks of Darius "crying out to Daniel, and inquiring if he was saved" (εἰ σώζεται, *Antiq.* x. 11, 6). No such addition is found in Theodotion's version.

§ 9. *The Psalter of Solomon and the Assumption of Moses.*

The *Psalter of Solomon*, or the *Psalms of the Pharisees*,¹ goes back to the Herodian era, and has been generally supposed to contain a reference to the death of Pompey on the sands of Alexandria. In that case the book cannot be placed later than B.C. 40, and is probably several decades earlier. Frankenberg, however, disputes the allusion to the murder of Pompey, and gives good reasons for assigning the work to the Maccabean era.² The writer of Ps. iii. 16 in this interesting collection seems to refer to the Book of Daniel xii. 1. He writes: "But they that from the Lord shall rise again unto life eternal, and their life shall be in the light of the Lord, and it shall fail no more." Other references may possibly be pointed out, but these may suffice.

In the *Assumption of Moses*, an apocryphon which belongs to some period between B.C. 7 and A.D. 30,³ there are several allusions to the Book of Daniel. As Professor Charles has pointed out, mention is made in ch. vi. of the Maccabean era, and of the illegitimate and Hellenising high priests raised to that office by Antiochus Epiphanes. The breach between the Chasidim and the

¹ *Psalms of the Pharisees, commonly called the Psalms of Solomon.* The text newly revised from all the MSS. Edited, with introduction, English translation, notes, appendix and indices, by Herbert Edward Ryle, M.A. [now D.D. and Lord Bishop of Winchester] and Montague R. James, M.A. Cambridge University Press, 1891.

² *Die Datierung der Psalmen Salomos.* Ein Beitrag zur jüdischen Geschichte von Lic. th. W. Frankenberg. Giessen: J. Rickers, 1896.

³ *The Assumption of Moses.* Translated from the Latin sixteenth-century MS., the unemended text of which is published herewith, together with the text in its restored and critically emended form. Edited, with introduction, notes and indices, by R. H. Charles. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1897.

early Maccabees noticed in the Book of Enoch is mentioned in chs. viii. and ix. Distinct references to the Book of Daniel may be pointed out in chs. iv. 1-4, x. 2, 3, and a large portion of the work clearly indicates that its writer was familiar with that book.

§ 10. *The Book of 4 Esdras*

The great book, however, commonly known as 4 Esdras requires special attention. The book is of composite date, partly written in the first Christian century, but based upon earlier writings. The age of the writer of the main portion may be fairly deduced from the historical references in the vision of the great eagle presented in ch. xi. The eagle is a symbol of the Roman empire, and the destruction of that empire is predicted as to be brought about by the Lion out of the forest, or the Messiah. The twelve wings of the eagle represent twelve Roman emperors, the six on the right side being Cæsar, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero; the six on the left, Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vindex, Nymphidius, Peron. The three heads are Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian.

The four kingdoms of Daniel are expressly mentioned in ch. xi. The interpretation, however, which Daniel gave of the fourth empire was not fully endorsed by Esdras (ch. xii. 11, 12). There are grand passages to be found in his work, and much deep thinking on eschatological and theological questions. The literature of the exposition of this curious work is very large. A few of the more important works of recent scholars are given below.¹

¹ *Das vierte Buch Ezra auf seine Quellen untersucht* von Richard Kabisch, Lic. von Theol., Göttingen, 1889. *Eschatology: A Critical*

§ 11. *The Book of Jubilees*

The Book of Jubilees cannot be overlooked in a review of the books belonging to Maccabean times in which traces of the influence of Daniel can be detected. The book, the original of which was probably Hebrew or Aramaic, was known to the early Fathers through a Greek version, and termed ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις, or the *Little Genesis*. The Ethiopic version has been edited by Professor Charles in the *Anect. Oxon.* in 1895. A German translation of the work by Dr Enno Littmann, with critical notes, is contained in Professor Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen* (1898 and 1899), and an English translation, with introductory notes, was published by Professor Charles in 1902.

Littmann considers the book to have been written between a century before and a century after Christ. Charles, in his *Eschatology* (p. 245), published 1899, considers it must have been written before A.D. 10. A closer examination of the book, however, has induced Charles to assign it to B.C. 105. The reason for the latter conclusion is that the writer was a Pharisee, and a serious and public breach occurred between that sect and Hyrcanus somewhere about B.C. 96, after which the Sadducees came into power.

The references to Daniel are found in ch. xv. 31, 32,

History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity, being the Jowett Lectures for 1898-9, by R. H. Charles, D.D., Professor of Biblical Greek, T.C.D.; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1899. *The Fourth Book of Ezra*, by the late Prof. Bensly and M. R. James, Litt.D.; Camb. University Press, 1895, in "Camb. Texts and Studies." Prof. Dr Hermann Gunkel in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A.T.*, vol. ii. Tübingen, 1900.

where angels are stated to have been placed in authority over the nations to lead them astray. In the case of Israel, the Most High is represented as being their special ruler, who "will preserve them and require them at the hand of all His angels and His spirits." The statement is supposed to harmonise with Dan. x. 13, 20, 21 and xii. 1. That deduction is not conclusive.

Although the direct reference to the Book of Daniel or to its teaching may be questioned, the account given in Jubilees xxiii. 16-31, which appears to refer to the Chasidim or the Puritan party in the early days of the Maccabees, is instructive in throwing an important side-light on the history of those times. The protest of the younger Puritan party against the sins of their fathers, and against the guilt incurred by breaking the covenant which the Lord made with Israel, may be compared with the description in Dan. xi. 30 and subsequent verses. Idolatry is not, however, distinctly mentioned, though probably included under the terms "uncleanness and fornication and pollution and abominations" (ver. 14). The abrogation of circumcision, etc., is referred to in the statement that "they have forgotten commandment and covenant, and feasts, and months, and sabbaths, and jubilees, and all judgments" (ver. 19). The backsliding Jews are accused of having defiled "the holy of holies with their uncleanness and the corruption of their pollution" (ver. 21). Compare the description in 2 Macc. vi. 4-11, although "the heathen" are specially noticed in that passage, rather than renegade Jews. The acts of the heathen are referred to in the following verses (22-26), and the revival of the study of the Law among the people of Israel as introducing to better times.

It is interesting to note that the Book of Jubilees takes

a very different view of the Philistines than is taken in the Book of Zechariah. The former work speaks of that people as utterly destroyed, whereas Zechariah predicted (ix. 6, 7) their ultimate absorption into the nation of Israel.

In referring to the Book of Jubilees, and Professor Charles' valuable work done in its exposition, we cannot, however, avoid protesting against his views on the Maccabean priest-kings. There is no evidence whatever to justify the statement that "the Maccabean princes claimed in some respects to represent the priesthood of Melchizedek" (Charles, *Introd.* p. xii.). There is certainly a lacuna in the text of Jub. xiii. 25, but it is unwarrantable to fill it by a reference to Melchizedek which would justify such a statement. The assumption of the position of prince and priest by the Maccabees was an offence to the pious party among the Jews, but the title given to them of "priests of the Most High God" (Josephus, *Antiq.* xvi. 6. 2; *Rosh ha-Shanah*, 18 *b*) is no proof that they claimed to be priests "after the order of Melchizedek." For it is admitted that the author of the Jubilees was a Pharisee, and he distinctly gives that title to Levi "and to his sons for ever" (Jub. xxxii. 1), in which passage reference is made to the Aaronic priesthood of the Levitical Law. If, therefore, the title of "priests of the Most High God" were given to the Maccabean priest-princes, it would not prove that any reference was made to the peculiar priesthood of Melchizedek.

Nor do we admit that Psalm cx. is Maccabean. It is strange how disposed Christian critics are to speculations which tend to weaken or destroy the value of the New Testament. Cheyne, in his Bampton Lectures on the *Origin of the Psalter*, endeavours to destroy the evidence

afforded in Zech. vi. to Psalm. cx. by interpolating (without the authority of MSS. or Versions) into the prophecy of Zechariah a clause based on a critical "conjecture" of Ewald, affirming that a second crown was to be placed by Zechariah upon the head of Zerubbabel, who was a scion of the family of David—which Joshua, the high priest crowned by Zechariah, was not. As the Hebrew text stands, the prophecy of Zechariah cannot refer to Joshua, the high priest upon whose head the crown of silver and gold was placed by that prophet,—it must refer to the Messiah who was to come. The very name "Branch" in Zech. vi. refers to Jer. xxiii. 5, which is another proof that "Messiah the son of David" was spoken of. Zech. vi. proves that "Messiah the Son of David" was to be both priest and king, and was the person pointed out in Ps. cx. The modern treatment of evidence is tantamount to "depraving" the sacred text. Cheyne's views have been adopted by many scholars. Professor G. Bickell goes even further. He is an eminent scholar, and a Roman Catholic. But his ingenuity seeks to discover an acrostic of Simon Maccabeus in Psalm cx., in support of Cheyne's argument that the psalm in question was written to commemorate the elevation of that Maccabee chieftain to the position of prince and high priest (1 Macc. xiv. 41-47). That "discovery" Professor Charles has endorsed in an article on "The Messiah of Old Testament Prophecy" in the *Expositor* for April 1902, p. 252, and in his edition of the Jubilees. The "acrostic" is supposed to exist in the first four verses. The name *Simon* in Hebrew, as ordinarily written, has five letters (שמעון). The first letter occurs in the middle of Ps. cx. 1, in the word "*sit*." The second letter occurs in the Hebrew word for "*rod*," with which ver. 2 opens. The third letter occurs in

the word “*people*,” with which ver. 3 opens. So far, all runs smoothly enough. The last two letters in the Hebrew name Simon are *vav* and *nun*. Those two letters have to be extracted, either by reversing the two opening sentences of ver. 4, or by supposing that the name is written defectively. No acrostic can be made out without some violence being done to the text, so as to make the psalm Maccabean. If it be argued that “Simon” may be written defectively (שמון), it should be noted that in all Jewish coins in which that name actually occurs (like those of the first revolt in the time of Vespasian) it is written fully. Simon Maccabeus was the first to strike Jewish coins; but his own coins, however, do not mention his name.

Even if it were admitted that an acrostic of “Simon” could be made out in the first four verses, the question arises—Was the acrostic intended, or is it purely accidental? The letters used in the name “Simon” might be read in many other passages, for they are so common in Hebrew. The name was a common one, and the existence of such an acrostic is not sufficient to prove anything. Why was the acrostic confined to *four* out of *seven* verses? Why does it begin in the middle of ver. 1?

All discoveries of “acrostics” are highly suspicious. Acrostics of “Jehovah” have been pointed out in the Book of Esther. See my *Introduction to the Old Testament*, fourth edition (Hodder & Stoughton, 1898), pp. 141–144. The 666 of Rev. xiii. 18 can be twisted in all directions, Papal and Protestant alike, and that number has also been utilised for Rationalistic argumentation. Hence it is unwise to follow such will-o’-the-wisps, however learned the scholars may be who amuse

themselves with such treacherous "lights," and fall into bogs of their own devising.

It is almost impossible that a psalm in honour of Simon Maccabeus, in B.C. 140, could have been added to the Psalter and unanimously accepted by the Jewish nation as inspired. The Assidæans, or Chasidim (*the pious*), so slightingly referred to in 1 Macc., were the chief mainstay of the Jewish patriotic insurrection. Those Chasidim, or Puritans, were the real backbone of the Jewish nation. They were deeply displeased with the usurpation of the Maccabees. Plain traces of that dislike are discoverable (as Professor Charles has pointed out in his edition of the Book of Enoch) in the literature which bears that patriarch's name, large "remains" of which are embedded in that curious book. The Chasidim afterwards developed into the Pharisee party. That that party, large as it then was, as seen from the *Book of Enoch*, the *Assumption of Moses*, the *Psalter of Solomon*, etc., would have tolerated the introduction of a new psalm into the Psalter, and allowed a whole book, like that of Daniel, to be incorporated among the books deemed Sacred, appears to us almost an historical impossibility.

§ 12. *The New Testament and Apostolic Fathers*

Over sixty passages of Daniel are referred to or quoted in the books of the New Testament. Such quotations occur mainly in the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke). Those Gospels refer twenty times to the book. Two references to it, endorsing its marvellous histories, occur in the Epistle to the Hebrews. See Heb. xi. 33, 34. One reference is found in the first Epistle of Peter (i. 23), one in the Epistle of Jude, while

forty-seven references are to be found in the Book of the Revelation. No one denies that the references made to the apostasy of the latter times in 2 Thess. ii. 4 (where there is a verbal quotation), in 1 Tim. iv., and to "the Antichrist" in St John's first and second epistles, are based upon the Book of Daniel. Thus over *sixty* different passages of Daniel are at least referred in some *seventy-eight* places of the New Testament. Indeed, it would be easy to raise the number considerably over eighty (see Index).

The importance of this to the Christian commentator will be seen by a more close examination of the passages.

Little importance may be attached to the mere use of phrases in the Book of Daniel (Dan. iv. 12, 21) found in Matt. xiii. 32, Mark iv. 32, Luke xiii. 19; or even the language of Daniel ii. 28 in Matt. xxiv. 6, Mark xiii. 7, Luke xxi. 9. Of scarcely more importance is it to note that in Matt. xxiv. 10 language found in Dan. xi. 41 is used, because the words are perhaps not used in the same sense (see, however, *Crit. Comm.*), or the quotation from Dan. vi. 26 found in 1 Pet. i. 23 (R.V.). The connection between Dan. viii. 10 and Luke xxi. 24, for exegetical reasons, ought not to be pressed.

The connection between Dan. xii. 3 and Matt. xiii. 43 would not of itself be of much importance, but for the quotation of the same part of Daniel in our Lord's discourse in Matt. xxv. 46, where Dan. xii. 2 is referred to; and in Matt. xxiv. 21 and Mark xiii. 10, where Dan. xii. 1 is also alluded to.

The references in Matt. xxiv. 15, where "Daniel the prophet" is mentioned by name, as well as in Mark xiii. 14, where our Lord refers to the "abomination of desolation" specially spoken of in Dan. ix. 27, xii. 11, are of great importance as endorsements on the part of our

Lord of the truth of Daniel's prophecy. For reasons stated in this work and in our *Critical Commentary*, we do not refer to Dan. xi. 31.

The quotations from, and allusions to, the great prophecy of Dan. vii. 13, of the coming of the Son of man in the clouds of heaven, are also of great importance, as special endorsements of that prophecy by our Lord. See Matt. xxiv. 30 ; Mark xiii. 26 ; Luke xxi. 27 ; and Rev. i. 7. The same prophecy was made use of by our Lord in the most solemn moment of His life, when He stood before the Jewish Sanhedrin. See Matt. xxvi. 94 ; Mark xiv. 62 ; Luke xxii. 69.

Other references are noted in the *Critical Commentary*, and will be found scheduled in the General Index. The reference to "Michael the archangel" in Jude 9 may possibly be derived from Dan. xii. 1.

The references to Daniel in the Book of the Revelation need scarcely be more than mentioned. Apart from verbal quotations, the great prophecy of Dan. vii. is constantly borne in mind, and the appearance of the Son of man, with the effect it had on Daniel, is several times quoted by the Apostle in recounting his own experiences.

The following list of references in the Revelation may be interesting :—

Rev. i. 7 refers to Dan. vii. 13 ; Rev. i. 13, to Dan. vii. 13, x. 5 ; Rev. i. 14, 15, to Dan. vii. 9, x. 6 ; Rev. i. 17, to Dan. xii. 19 ; Rev. i. 19, to Dan. ii. 29 ; Rev. ii. 10, to Dan. i. 14 ; Rev. iv. 9, 10, to Dan. iv. 34 ; Rev. v. 11, to Dan. vii. 10 ; Rev. vii. 14, to Dan. xii. 1 ; Rev. ix. 20, to Dan. v. 3, 4, 23 ; Rev. x. 4, to Dan. viii. 26, xii. 4 ; Rev. x. 5, to Dan. xii. 7 ; Rev. x. 7, to Dan. ix. 6, 10 ; Rev. x. 11, to Dan. iii. 4 ; Rev. xi. 2, to Dan. viii. 13 ; Rev. xi. 7, to Dan. vii. 3, 7 ; Rev. xi. 13, to

Dan. ii. 19 ; Rev. xi. 18, to Dan. ix. 6 ; Rev. xii. 3, to Dan. vii. 7 ; Rev. xii. 4, to Dan. viii. 10 ; Rev. xii. 7, to Dan. x. 13, 20 ; Rev. xii. 14, to Dan. vii. 25, xii. 7 ; Rev. xiii. 1, to Dan. vii. 3, 7 ; Rev. xiii. 2, to Dan. vii. 4, 6 ; Rev. xiii. 5, to Dan. iii. 5, 6, vii. 8 ; Rev. xiii. 7, to Dan. vii. 21 ; Rev. xiii. 8, to Dan. xii. 1 ; Rev. xiv. 2, to Dan. x. 6 ; Rev. xiv. 8, to Dan. iv. 30 ; Rev. xiv. 14, to Dan. vii. 13, x. 16 ; Rev. xvi. 11, to Dan. ii. 19 ; Rev. xvi. 19, xvii. 5, to Dan. iv. 30 ; Rev. xvii. 3, to Dan. vii. 7 ; Rev. xvii. 8, to Dan. vii. 3, xii. 1 ; Rev. xvii. 12, to Dan. vii. 24 ; Rev. xvii. 14, to Dan. ii. 47 ; and Rev. xviii. 2, 10, to Dan. iv. 30 (?).

The Apostolic Fathers.—*Clement of Rome*, in his Epistle to the Corinthians xxxiv., refers to the ten thousands of angels mentioned in Dan. vii. 10. In ch. xlv. he quotes the cases of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego in the fire, and of Daniel in the den of lions. *Barnabas*, in his Epistle, ch. iv., refers at some length to the prophecy of Dan. vii. concerning the fourth beast and the three horns uprooted by the little horn. *Ignatius*, in his Epistle to the Magnesians, ch. vi., refers to Dan. ii. 44 and vii. 14, 27. *Hermas* refers, in the name Thegri or Segri (see *Crit. Comm.*, Appendix No. I.), to the story of the lions' den, and in *Visions* i. 3 to "the Books of Life."

The references to Daniel in later writers, such as Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Irenæus, Hippolytus, including the recent discoveries of the commentary of the last-named Father on Daniel, are too numerous to be given. Some of these will be found cited in our *Critical Commentary*. There is from the end of the second century onward a continually increasing mass of references to the book.

CHAPTER III

THE HISTORICAL NARRATIVES OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL

§ 1. *The Opening Chapter of Daniel, and Nebuchadnezzar's Campaigns against Judah*

THE phraseology of the opening verse of Daniel is similar to that of 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6, 10, and 2 Kings xxiv. 1. Ewald has, therefore, conjectured that the words in Daniel were derived from these sources. If the conjecture be correct, it may fairly be assumed that the three narratives will be found in substantial agreement. The words of the Chronicler give the impression that the expedition of Nebuchadnezzar against Jerusalem there recorded took place in the eleventh year of the reign of Jehoiakim (2 Chron. xxxvi. 6).

The account in Chronicles does not exclude the idea of an earlier invasion. It states that Nebuchadnezzar came up against Jehoiakim, "and bound him in fetters in order to carry him to Babylon." The deportation of the fallen monarch is not recorded in 2 Kings, and the evidence supplied by the Book of Jeremiah implies that Nebuchadnezzar's original intention was not carried into effect.

The Chronicler may be speaking of the expedition of Nebuchadnezzar against Jehoiakim which occurred prior to the eleventh year of the latter monarch. As a result

of this expedition, Nebuchadnezzar carried away a portion of the vessels of the house of the Lord and put them in his temple at Babylon (2 Chron. xxxvi. 7). The latter statement is corroborated by the narrative of Daniel, which, as might have been expected, is more precise: "And he carried them into the land of Shinar, to the house of his god, and he brought the vessels into the treasure house of his god" (Dan. i. 2).¹

Two expeditions of Nebuchadnezzar against Jerusalem in the reign of Jehoiakim are briefly recorded in the second Book of Kings—the first commanded by Nebuchadnezzar in person (2 Kings xxiv. 1), the second apparently under the direction of his generals (2 Kings xxiv. 2). In the second of these campaigns the invading army was strengthened by forces raised from among allies in the vicinity of the Holy Land, namely, by "bands of the Syrians, and bands of the Moabites, and bands of the children of Ammon." The writer of the Book of Kings does not speak of Jerusalem itself having been besieged on either of these occasions. Nor does he mention that Jehoiakim was bound in fetters, nor state that any of the vessels of the sanctuary were carried away to Babylon. According to his narrative, Nebuchadnezzar reduced Jehoiakim to a vassal in the early part of his reign, and after three years Jehoiakim rebelled against Nebuchadnezzar. In consequence of that revolt, a second Chaldean army, aided by Syrian, Moabitish, and Ammonite allies, was sent "against Judah to destroy it." The distress caused by that invasion was very great, and was a judgment from God because of the innocent blood which had been shed by Manasseh in Jerusalem, which blood "the Lord would not pardon" (2 Kings xxiv.

¹ See *Critical Commentary* on this passage.

3, 4). The city of Jerusalem itself must therefore in that campaign have suffered severely.

The writer of the Book of Kings speaks of Jerusalem as having been first captured after a regular siege in the reign of Jehoiakim's son Jehoiachin. The siege was commenced by "the servants of Nebuchadnezzar," but the city was not, however, taken until Nebuchadnezzar himself appeared on the scene. The king of Babylon then carried off Jehoiachin into captivity, with a large number of the nobles, warriors, and craftsmen of Judah. The Temple and the royal palace were sacked, and all their treasures carried off, comprising the vessels of gold made by Solomon, which were cut in pieces in order to be more easily transported to Babylon (2 Kings xxiv. 13-17).

According to Jeremiah xlvi. 2, Nebuchadnezzar won the decisive battle of Carchemish over the Egyptians and their allies in "the fourth year of Jehoiakim." Carchemish had in former days been the capital of the Hittite empire. It was a strong fortress commanding the fords of the Euphrates. In the reign of Sargon (B.C. 717) the fortress passed into the possession of the Assyrians. The result of the battle of Carchemish was that all the countries "from the brook of Egypt unto the river Euphrates" fell into the hands of the king of Babylon (2 Kings xxiv. 7).

The fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim was, according to Jer. xxv. 1, the first year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. In that year Jeremiah predicted the ultimate conquest of Judah and of the neighbouring countries by Nebuchadnezzar. The seventy years' captivity of Israel in Babylon is therefore dated from that epoch (Jer. xxv. 11). In the same year Jeremiah committed to writing the prophecies he had uttered "against

Israel and against Judah" (Jer. xxxvi. 1, 2), that "the house of Judah might learn the evil decreed against them, and might return every man from his evil way." An opportunity for repentance was thus afforded to Judah as late as the fourth year of Jehoiakim, or B.C. 606.

The statement of Jeremiah that an opportunity for repentance was given in the fourth year of Jehoiakim makes it difficult to believe that Nebuchadnezzar could actually have captured Jerusalem in the third year of Jehoiakim, as stated in Dan. i. 1. The statements are not, however, irreconcilable. Jerusalem may have been captured, and Jehoiakim put in fetters for a time, and released from bondage after his acknowledgment of Nebuchadnezzar as supreme lord. The temporary capture of Jerusalem and its escape from utter destruction would have been a suitable occasion on which to call the Jewish nation to repentance before a heavier judgment fell upon them.

There are, moreover, other possible explanations of the difficulty, which difficulty may be altogether owing to the scanty information we possess.

(1) There may be an error in the numeral used in Dan. i. 1; and if, as will appear in the course of our investigations, it be probable that the portions of the Book of Daniel extant in Hebrew are only translations of an Aramaic original, such an error is quite possible.

(2) Another way of meeting the difficulty has been proposed. R. Stanley Poole maintains that "the Babylonian year commenced earlier than the Hebrew, so that Nebuchadnezzar's first year commenced in Jehoiakim's third year, and was current in his fourth" (see art. "Chronology" in Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, note on p. 324). Fuller (in the *Speaker's Commentary*) maintains that there

was a difference of about half a year between the Hebrew and Babylonian styles, the Jewish year commencing in autumn, the Babylonian in the spring. Dr George Smith has pointed out that the Assyrian and Babylonian monarchs reckoned their first year as the first full new year that occurred after their accession to the throne. Little weight ought therefore to be ascribed to "discrepancies" which (if fuller information were at hand) might ultimately prove evidences in favour of the historical character of the book.

In the absence of precise and detailed information, a different order of events from that already mentioned has been put forward. Pharaoh Necho, king of Egypt, made an expedition (B.C. 610-600) against the new Babylonian empire which had been erected upon the ruins of the Assyrian empire, which had been shattered in pieces by Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar, and his Median allies. As the Egyptian king was then in possession of a powerful fleet, Necho conceived the idea of transporting a large army by sea to the parts of Palestine north of the kingdom of Judah. If he could once gain possession of the territory which had belonged to the kingdom of Israel, he hoped to make himself master of the fords of the Euphrates. Josiah, king of Judah, was indignant at the occupation of a country which he naturally looked upon as *de jure* (if not *de facto*) part of the territory belonging to Judah after the overthrow of the schismatic kingdom of Israel, and the deportation of the greater portion of its inhabitants by the king of Assyria. The Jewish king, therefore, collected an army to prevent the Egyptians from seizing that country. In vain did Necho assure Josiah that he had no intention to make war upon him (2 Chron. xxxv. 21);

Josiah continued to advance, and the Egyptians were compelled to fight at Megiddo, where they gained a decisive victory over Josiah, who fell on that battle-field. Pharaoh Necho, after his victory, was obliged, before advancing northward, to settle matters at Jerusalem. He deposed Jehoahaz, the son of Josiah, and made his brother king in his place, under the name of Jehoiakim. Necho then advanced to "Riblah in the land of Hamath" (2 Kings xxiii. 33), which lay on the way toward Carchemish on the Euphrates.

Nabopolassar was still king of Babylon, but, owing to his age, was unable to endure the hardships of war. Nebuchadnezzar his son accordingly took the chief command of the Babylonian army, and, in a decisive battle at Carchemish, defeated the Egyptian forces. Necho was compelled to retreat to Egypt in order to obtain reinforcements, while Nebuchadnezzar, rapidly pursuing, took possession of Jerusalem, probably without serious opposition, put Jehoiakim in fetters, but afterwards restored him to the royal position as an acknowledged vassal of the great king of Babylon. The death of Nabopolassar, however, compelled Nebuchadnezzar to return to Babylon to set matters there in order. Meanwhile Pharaoh Necho had raised a more powerful army than before, and again invaded Palestine. The number of his soldiers was on that occasion compared by Jeremiah to a mighty inundation of the Nile (Jer. xlvi. 7-9). The Babylonian generals, who had partly overrun Palestine and the neighbouring countries, were, in their turn, forced to retire upon Carchemish. Pharaoh Necho was for a time everywhere successful. He took Gaza, the stronghold of the Philistines, and other towns along the sea-coast (Jer. xlvii.). Nebuchadnezzar, however, soon

returned in person to the rescue of his troops, and in a second terrible battle at Carchemish, vividly portrayed in Jer. xlvi., annihilated the army of the king of Egypt.

It is impossible to assign each of those events to particular years, or to relate with any certainty what actually took place at Jerusalem, until more light has been shed upon those matters by a larger discovery of inscriptions. The language, however, of Jeremiah (xxv. 3-9) certainly gives the impression that the invasion of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar did not take place before the first part of the fourth year of Jehoiakim, and the incident recorded in Jer. xxvi. 21-23, in reference to the murder of the prophet Urijah by Jehoiakim, shows that in the early part of his reign Jehoiakim had made an alliance with Egypt.

Berosus, the Chaldean historian, gives the following account of the first invasion of Nebuchadnezzar :—When Nabopolassar,¹ the father of Nabouchodonosor (Nebuchadnezzar), heard that the satrap who had been appointed in Egypt,² and in the places about Cælo-Syria and Phœnicia, had fallen away from his alliance,³ not being able himself any longer to endure the hardships of war (*κακοπαθεῖν*), he handed over to his son Nabouchodonosor, then of full age, a certain part of the army, and sent him against him [the rebellious satrap, as the king of Egypt is contemptuously styled]. But Nabouchodonosor having met the rebel (*τῷ ἀποστάτῃ*) in battle, and having beaten him, conquered him, and brought the country which formed part of his government under his own kingdom

¹ So Didot reads; see Müller, p. 506. Oberthür has *Ναβουχοδονόσορος*.

² *ὅτι ὁ τεταγμένος σατράπης ἐν τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ.*

³ *ἀποστάτης αὐτοῦ γέγονεν.*

(*i.e.* under Babylonian rule). But at the same time it came to pass that Nabopolassar,¹ who had been in bad health, died in the city of the Babylonians after a reign of twenty-one years. But Nabouchodonosor, having heard not long after of the death of his father, and having arranged matters in Egypt and in the rest of the country, and having handed over to certain of his friends the captives of the Jews and Phœnicians and Syrians, and of the natives of Egypt, that they might bring them back to Babylonia, along with the heavy-armed troops, and the other military implements, proceeded by forced marches with a small escort through the desert to Babylon. Having taken upon himself the charge of the public affairs managed by the Chaldeans, and the kingdom which had been kept (for him) by their chief,² having thus become master of the whole of his father's kingdom, he made arrangements that colonies should be settled in the most suitable parts of Babylonia for the captives when they should arrive.³

Berosus relates these facts from the Babylonian point of view. The contemptuous style in which Pharaoh Necho is spoken of as a rebellious "satrap" is in accordance with the Babylonian pretensions of regarding all the kingdoms of the world as rightfully their own. The language used in Jer. xxvii. 5, 6, and that of Cyrus, recorded in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 23, is very similar.

Some critics believe that the prophecies of Jeremiah recorded in ch. xxv. 9 ff., and delivered "in the fourth year of Jehoiakim," refer exclusively to the final destruc-

¹ The same variety of reading exists here as mentioned in note 1.

² The Greek is *ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως αὐτῶν*.

³ This fragment of Berosus is quoted by Josephus in *Antiq. Jud.*

tion of Jerusalem in the reign of Zedekiah. But it would be more correct to regard those threatenings of Jeremiah as referring to all the expeditions of Nebuchadnezzar. For those denunciations, with similar prophecies, were collected into a book (Jer. xxxvi. 1-3) in the early part of the fourth year of Jehoiakim, in the hope that the people of Judah might even then be stirred up to repentance (Jer. xxxvi. 6, 7). In the latter part of the fifth year of Jehoiakim, that monarch burned the roll containing Jeremiah's prophecies. The same prophecies were, however, rewritten and re-edited: "and there were added besides unto them many like words" (Jer. xxxvi. 32). It is impossible, therefore, to argue that the Book of Jeremiah contains the exact words of the prophecies as originally delivered, or say that the threatenings of ch. xxv. refer only to the final destruction of Jerusalem.

The fast proclaimed by the people of Judah in the ninth month, or Kislev (Nov.-Dec.), of the fifth year of Jehoiakim (Jer. xxxvi. 9) was probably a civil fast instituted because that month was the anniversary of the capture of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, which had occurred in the fourth year of Jehoiakim. If this be the case, it explains why the godless Jehoiakim specially encouraged the observance of that particular fast, the call for which seems to have originated with "the people" (Jer. xxxvi. 9). Jehoiakim was at that time seeking to stir up popular hostility against the Chaldean supremacy under which he was chafing.¹ Days of fasting were instituted, with the object of averting Divine judgments threatened (as 2 Sam. xii. 15 ff.; 1 Kings xxi. 27;

¹ See Kliefoth, pp. 57 ff., and Keil, introductory remarks on ch. i. 1, 2.

Esther iv. 1, 3, 16), and often also to keep alive a penitential remembrance of chastisements previously inflicted (1 Sam. xxi. 13; 2 Sam. i. 12; Zech. vii. 5; Ezra x. 6 ff.; Neh. i. 4). Hence they might well be used also for a political purpose.

On the occasion of the fast in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, Baruch, by the direction of Jeremiah, read in the courts of the Temple all the prophecies concerning the coming woes formerly pronounced by that prophet, in order to acquaint the Jews with those predictions, and also in the hope that they might turn from the path of disobedience and submit themselves to the Divine will. Had the Jews believed the prophecies which were then read in their ears, they would have been unwilling to rebel against the Chaldeans. The object which Jehoiakim had in view in acceding to the request for a public fast was to stir up the people against the Chaldeans by calling to mind the severe treatment which the Jews had already experienced at their hands. Hence the king destroyed the roll which Baruch had written at the dictation of Jeremiah. The narrative of Jeremiah xxxvi. 9 ff., so far (as Hitzig imagined) from being inconsistent with the hypothesis that Jerusalem had been taken the previous year, is in harmony with it. Nor are the threats denounced against Jehoiakim himself (Jer. xxxvi. 30, 31) opposed to that view. Those threatenings pointed to a heavier calamity coming upon Jerusalem and her king (compare Jer. xxxvi. 29).

(2) There is yet another method which has been suggested of harmonising the statements of Dan. i. 1 with those of the other sacred writers, namely, to translate the clause in that verse, "*Nebuchadnezzar set out for Jerusalem,*" in place of "*came to Jerusalem.*" The verb there used

signifies not only *to come*, but under certain circumstances can be rendered *to go, to set out towards a place*.¹ The word, as Kranichfeld has pointed out, might be naturally employed in the signification of *setting out for*, when the movement referred to is conceived as commencing at the place of the writer who observes or narrates the occurrence. In such cases the beginning of the expedition is present to the writer's mind.

Jehoiachin, who succeeded to the throne on the death of Jehoiakim, reigned only three months (2 Kings xxiv. 6), after which period he was compelled to surrender to Nebuchadnezzar, and was carried into captivity, with a large number of the nobles and of the mighty men of valour. Jehoiachin languished in prison thirty-seven years, until the accession of Evil-Merodach, the successor of Nebuchadnezzar on the throne of Babylon (2 Kings xxv. 27). As the reign of Jehoiakim lasted eleven years, and Nebuchadnezzar reigned forty-three years, Keil considers it probable that Nebuchadnezzar ascended the throne about the fifth year of Jehoiakim. The eleven years of Jehoiakim's reign were probably not eleven full years, if the analogy of the other reigns spoken of in the Books of the Kings be taken as a guide. The tenth year of Zedekiah corresponded with the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xxxii. 1), while the eleventh year of Jehoiakim is called the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxv. 2, 8 ; Jer. lii. 5, 12). As Jehoiachin reigned only three months, his father Jehoiakim's death probably occurred either in the seventh or eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. Nebuchadnezzar (who reigned contemporaneously with Jehoiakim about six full years, and possibly some months over) must have ascended the throne

¹ See *Critical Commentary* on ch. i. 1.

in the fifth year of Jehoiakim, about a year after the battle of Carchemish.

(3) Some critics have further attempted to make out that there is a discrepancy between the date given in Dan. i. 1 and that in Dan. ii. 1 ff. Mention is made in the first chapter of the deportation of Jewish captives to Babylon, and of a certain number of those captives being selected to receive three years' instruction in the learning and wisdom of the Chaldeans. Those three years must have been past when Nebuchadnezzar, in the second year of his reign (Dan. ii. 1), saw the dream of the great image, for Daniel and his companions were then included among the number of "the wise men of Babylon." If the capture of Jerusalem occurred in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, one year before Nebuchadnezzar ascended the throne of Babylon, the three years' tuition of Daniel and his companions, spoken of in ver. 5, had full time to have run their course. The supposition that the tuition of the selected Jewish captives commenced a full year before Nebuchadnezzar's actual accession to the throne is not necessarily at variance with the account of Berosus, according to which Nebuchadnezzar, on hearing of his father's death, hastened to Babylon with a small band of followers, leaving the bulk of his army with the prisoners to follow by slow marches. A few captives of noble birth, intended to be trained specially for the imperial civil service, might easily have accompanied Nebuchadnezzar's escort. The great mass of the captives, who were so numerous as to require to be located in "colonies," would naturally follow with the main army.

The fairest conclusion, therefore, which can be drawn from such a general survey is that the evidence at present available does not justify the assertion that the statements

in Dan. i. 1-4 are at variance with historical facts. The writer seems to have been well acquainted with the Books of the Kings and the Chronicles, and with the Book of Jeremiah, and, apart from all other considerations, it is unlikely that, in the opening of his book, he would have utterly ignored their histories.

§ 2. *The Narrative of the Fiery Furnace* (Dan. iii.)

The question that confronts the critic at the outset of a discussion of this narrative is serious. It is generally acknowledged that the narrative must either be regarded as partially or wholly historical; or as a *mashal*, that is, a parable or narrative invented for a didactic purpose.

If the narrative be considered historical, it is necessary to show that the "miracle" recorded was a "sign" which can be justified on the principles of previously recorded Divine revelations. Every "miracle" had some distinct purpose. A true miracle is a "sign," designed "for teaching." But to render it credible as such, a cause worthy of the Divine intervention must be pointed out.

It will be fully admitted that narratives which record "miraculous" events ought to be duly examined, and not accepted without careful consideration. It is not necessary here to define in what a "miracle" consists. It may, or may not, presuppose an interference with what are termed "laws of nature," or it may be simply the putting into action some higher power, known or unknown, whereby a result is attained which men are compelled to recognise as a manifestation of a higher power than human.

If it be admitted that such "signs" were manifested in the early history of Israel; if that people were brought out

of bondage to be a nation intended in matters of religion to be the "prophets" of humanity (Ps. cv. 15); if the theocracy be acknowledged as an old-world fact, and not a Jewish fable; if Jehovah was the God of Israel, who guided and overruled that people until He deemed fit in the fulness of the times to manifest His Son, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, as "the Life and Light of men,"—then the "signs" related in the first part of the Book of Daniel were "signs" necessary in order to show that there was a God that ruled the earth.

For the nation set apart as Jehovah's peculiar people had been trodden under foot. As the prophets of Israel had frequently foretold, the holy city was laid waste and the holy temple destroyed on account of repeated transgressions. Israel and Judah had been carried away into hopeless captivity, like other peoples whom the kings of Assyria overcame (2 Kings xix. 11, 12). Bel the god of Babylon had completely swallowed up the people of Jehovah (Jer. li. 44), and they, in prophetic language, were being digested at leisure as sweet morsels in the stomach of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. li. 34).

Surely such was a time when some Divine manifestation might have been expected, and an occasion on which words like those spoken by Isaiah concerning the great intervention in the days of Hezekiah might be appropriately used: "Now will I arise, saith Jehovah; now will I lift up myself; now will I be exalted" (Isa. xxxiii. 10). The deliverance of the three Jews from the burning fiery furnace, the handwriting on the wall of Belshazzar's palace, the protection of Daniel in the den of lions, were all Divine indications that Jehovah was with His people, even though swallowed up by the world-power or "the sea-monster." The Rock that had begotten them was not

unmindful of them, although they had forgotten their God (Deut. xxxii. 18); the rock of the enemies of Jehovah was not like the Rock of Israel (Deut. xxxii. 31). If it were true that "those who regard lying vanities (idols) forsake their own mercy" (Jonah ii. 8), it might be expected that some witnesses against idolatry would be wonderfully preserved, and though walking through the fire would not be burned (Isa. xliii. 2). The Divine handwriting on the wall declared Babylon's doom in the midst of Babylon's revelry for the sacrilege committed against Jehovah. The Psalmist exclaimed in the bitterness of his soul, "My soul is among lions" (Ps. lvii. 4). In the case of Daniel, an example was vouchsafed to exiled Israel of a prophet cast into a den of lions, and coming forth unharmed.

The credibility of the narratives must, of course, necessarily depend mainly upon the credibility of the book itself, and the credibility of the book has to be proved from the truth of its prophecies. It is upon those prophecies we rely, and rely with confidence. The predictions of Daniel are not prophecies written after the events predicted. The events predicted were not events belonging to the Maccabean age, but such as could not have been anticipated by human guesswork.

There are no doubt difficulties connected with the proportion between the height and breadth of the image represented as set up in the province of Dura. There is no contemporary narrative by which to correct the figures of the narrative. The image, as now admitted, need not have been formed of solid gold (compare the statements about the golden altar in the holy place in Exod. xxxviii. 30 and xxxix. 3 ff.). It may have been simply gilded, and the enormous amount of money

lavished on statues of the gods renders the story on that point credible. It has also been suggested that the height assigned may have included that of the lofty pedestal on which the colossus stood.

The question has often been asked, Where can Daniel himself have been during the time when that great gathering took place in the plain of Dura? He must certainly have been included among those who were required to be present. No information on the point is given in the narrative, for ch. ii. 49 casts no light on the question. It may be supposed that Daniel knew long before of the intention of the king concerning the matter. It is useless to speculate on such points, for there are no facts to build on. Ancient commentators conjectured that Daniel was sick, or absent on business of state. He may even have been present, as Hippolytus maintained, but not have been specially watched, because (as Calvin suggested) the assailants of the Jews preferred to begin by accusing persons of a lower position. When subordinate agents had been got out of the way, it would have been time enough to attack Daniel himself. The accusation against Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego may, moreover, have been preferred on a sudden impulse; and the sentence of condemnation took effect so rapidly that it is conceivable that all may have been over before the matter came under the notice of Daniel.

The statue erected was probably a statue of Bel or Marduk; it is even conceivable that it may have been a golden image of Nebuchadnezzar himself, suggested by the dream of the colossus. In that case the worship paid to it may have been designed to represent the homage due to Nebuchadnezzar, who claimed to be the earthly representative of the unseen God. This view of the

passage was held many centuries ago by Hippolytus. It has been occasionally revived by commentators of later times, although it has not obtained general adoption.

The details of the narrative will be found discussed in the *Critical Commentary*.

The narrative of ch. iii. cannot with any probability be viewed as a *mashal* or *similitude* designed to shadow forth the days of Antiochus Epiphanes.

The best modern critics who assign the Book of Daniel to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, assign it to a very special date, B.C. 164. There are substantial reasons according to their hypothesis for fixing on that date. These will be found discussed in a later chapter. But the persecution of Antiochus, which lasted only for a short period, was then past and gone, on the theory of the composition of the book at that period. The narrative, regarded as a *mashal*, had then practically ceased to be of much value.

Among the reasons given for treating the story as a parable is the fact of the existence of a similar legend concerning Abraham's deliverance from "the fire of the Chaldees," into which it was stated that he was cast for refusing to worship the gods of Nimrod. The latter legend arose from the name *Ur Kasdim* (Ur of the Chaldees, or "fire of the Chaldees"), given to the city in which Abraham originally dwelt (Gen. xi. 28, 31). The legend is referred to in the Targum on Isaiah x. 52, in the Midrash Rabba, and many other works. It was well known to both Jerome and Augustine, but it has no real bearing on the Book of Daniel.

§ 3. *The Madness of Nebuchadnezzar*

Professor Driver has well observed that, on the assumption that the narrative in Dan. iv. was the work of a contemporary hand, no valid objection can be raised against its credibility based on the account contained of Nebuchadnezzar's insanity. After such an admission by a scholar of sober judgment, distinctly in favour of the "results" reached by modern criticism on the several points of the book, it is unnecessary to review the extravagant statements by Lengerke and others. If the Book of Daniel can be proved to be Maccabean, then it is an open question whether the writer may not have worked up into the narrative popular tradition, modifying some of its details so as to make it suitable for the purpose of teaching the important lessons set forth at the close of the story.

Dr Pusey has at considerable length discussed the question of the form of madness described in the narrative. The kind of insanity alluded to is that often termed *lykanthropy*, because persons afflicted with it are wont to imagine themselves transformed into wild animals, such as wolves or dogs (hence it is also termed *kynanthropy*), lions, or other animals. Under the influence of such a madness, the sufferer, although at times conscious of his real character, imagines himself transformed into some animal which has caught hold of his diseased imagination, and consequently seeks to imitate its acts and cries. A perverted imagination leads on to a perverted appetite; and hence a man possessed with the hallucination that he is an ox would readily endeavour to eat grass as oxen, and deprive himself of the clothing worn by men. Such a being would necessarily be filled with

fury against all who might attempt to arouse him to a sense of his proper position as a man, and consequently might require, in times of strong frenzy, if not constantly, to be secured within well-defined limits. Thus he would naturally be confined in a paddock, "bound with fetters and chains" such as are incidentally alluded to in the story. Some scholars have declaimed against the absurdity of the incident (mentioned in the close of the chapter), that Nebuchadnezzar, at the end of the fateful seven years, lifted up his eyes to heaven in prayer. That incident, however, is in accordance with what has been observed as to the habits of lunatics.

Abydenus, who probably wrote in the second century after Christ, quotes from Megasthenes, a contemporary of Seleucus Nicator (B.C. 312-280), a tradition which may refer to Nebuchadnezzar's madness. The fragment has been preserved by Eusebius (*Præp. Evang.* ix. 41).¹ It has often been cited, but it may be useful here to quote the portion that bears upon the present narrative. The writer says:—

"But afterwards, *i.e.* after Nebuchadnezzar's great conquests, it is said by the Chaldeans that, having gone up upon the royal palace (*ἐπὶ τὰ βασιλῆϊα*), he was possessed by a god (*κατασχεθείη θεῶν*), so that, thus crying aloud, he said:—I, that Nebuchadnezzar, announce a coming misfortune which both Bel my ancestor and the queen Beltis are powerless to persuade the Fates to avert. A Persian mule [Cyrus] will come, making use of your own divinities as allies; he will bring slavery, whose assistant will be a Mede.² Would that, before he

¹ Another work of Megasthenes is quoted by Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* i. 15, as that of a writer who was a contemporary of Seleucus.

² *Μήδης*, or, if we adopt, after Schrader, v. Gutschmid's conjecture, *υἱὸς Μήδης*, son of a Median woman, *i.e.* Nabu-nā'id.

betrayed my citizens, some Charybdis or sea, having drawn him in, might utterly extinguish him ; or that, having gone elsewhere, he might be driven through the desert, where there is neither city nor track of men, but where wild beasts have their pasture and birds fly around, that in the rocks and ravines he might wander alone ; and that I, before these things were thrown into my mind, might have met a better fate. Having uttered this prophecy he disappeared (ἐφάνιστο).”

The resemblances between the legend recorded by Megasthenes and the narrative in Daniel cannot, as Bevan, Driver, and other scholars admit, be merely accidental. In both cases the king is described as walking on the roof of the royal palace. While boasting of his might in building that noble city, a voice from heaven announced his day of doom. The Babylonian legend describes him as prophesying under the inspiration of a god the woes coming on his country. Those scholars who are convinced that the Book of Daniel is fictitious may naturally be expected, with Schrader and Bevan, to maintain that the narrative in the Book of Daniel is a Judæo-Apocalyptic reconstruction of the Babylonian popular myth, which they consider to be presented in a more original form by Abydenus in the quotation from Megasthenes

No conclusion, however, adverse to the credibility of the narrative can be fairly drawn from any of the incidents mentioned in the narrative of Nebuchadnezzar's insanity. On the other hand, there is no sufficient evidence to deduce from that narrative any argument in favour of the authenticity of the Book of Daniel. No Babylonian inscription has yet been discovered which records Nebuchadnezzar's insanity. Hence we must be satisfied

with repelling attacks, and not venture to build up an argument on a matter on which there is no common basis of agreement.

There is nothing whatever to justify the hypothesis that the narrative had the remotest reference to Maccabean times, or can be fairly interpreted as a *mashal* or *didactic* story of that period. Apart from any such hypothesis, the narrative might be regarded as an allegory, in which the world-power is represented as driven mad by the Divine decree, and recovered from its madness at the expiration of the great "seven times" of the Gentiles, when the personified world-power may lift up the heart and eyes in prayer, and at last come to its senses by an acknowledgment of the power and might and majesty of the God of heaven. Sin is often represented in the Divine writings as insanity and madness. The prodigal son in the parable of our Lord (Luke xv. 17) is depicted as at last coming to himself, and fully awakened to a sense of his folly and sin. Nebuchadnezzar may possibly be a picture of the world-power in its madness, and his recovery from the state of insanity may depict the times when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ (Rev. xi. 15). There is, however, no clear indication in the narrative that such is its real meaning, and therefore we adhere, on the whole, to the plain historical interpretation of the passage. Such an indication may, however, be afforded in ch. vii. 4.

The various details of the narrative, which present difficulties to some minds, will be found discussed in the *Critical Commentary*.

CHAPTER IV

THE HISTORICAL NARRATIVES OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL (*continued*)

§ 1. *Belshazzar's Feast and Babylon's Overthrow*

IN order to present an intelligible view of the remarkable history recorded in Dan. v., one must sketch the events which occurred after the death of Nebuchadnezzar. That monarch died B.C. 561, and was succeeded by his son, Evil-Merodach.¹ According to Berosus, that king governed "lawlessly and extravagantly." There seems to have been for years a struggle going on between two parties in Babylon, one upholding the supremacy of the secular power, and the other upholding the priestly authority.

That internal strife probably led to the murder of Evil-Merodach, whose kindness towards Jehoiachin is spoken of in 2 Kings xxv. 27-30. That act of kindness towards the deposed Jewish monarch, according

¹ The name is so given in the English Biblical versions, 2 Kings xxv. 27, but it is variously written by Assyriologists as Avil- (or Awel-) Marduk (or Maruduk), *man of Maruduk*, or Avilu-Marduk (Schrader), or, as Winckler, Amil-Marduk. Awel-Maruduk is possible, and would be better (*Pinches*). Josephus (*Antiq. Jud.* x. 11. 2) writes the name Ἀβιλαμαρώδαχος, but when quoting from Berosus he gives it as Εὐείλμαράδουχος (*Contr. Apion.* i. 20). Berosus wrote B.C. 261-246.

to Winckler, was connected with a project of the restoration of the king and the people of Judah.¹

It is clear, however, that for some reason the Babylonian priests had taken alarm, and begun to form conspiracies against the throne. Whatever was the cause of this conspiracy to upset the throne which Nebuchadnezzar had invested with such glory, the chief conspirator against Evil-Merodach was Neriglissor, his own brother-in-law. The name is probably identical with Nergal-sharezer, one of Nebuchadnezzar's ablest generals (Jer. xxxix. 3, 13). The reign of the usurper lasted only four years. According to Winckler, he married a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar. He was succeeded by Labāsi-Marduk (or Labynetus I.), who was probably his son; but the latter king only reigned nine months, when he too was murdered.

Nabû-na'id (or Nabonedus), a Babylonian by race, who had been one of the chief conspirators against Labāsi-Marduk, then ascended the throne. Of the ancestry of that monarch nothing is known except that he was the son or descendant of one Nabû-balaṭ-su-iqbi, whom he styles *rubû êmqu*, "the deeply wise prince." Nabû-na'id cannot himself have been a son of Nebuchadnezzar, or have been connected by descent with that royal line; for such a fact would no doubt have been mentioned in Nabû-na'id's decrees. Schrader notices that Herodotus, who gives the name of Labynetus to Nebuchadnezzar (*K.A.T.* on Dan. iv. 1), speaks of the second Labynet as son of the former Labynet by Nitocris (book i. ch. 188). Queen Nitocris is credited by Herodotus with many marvellous works of engineering skill connected with the course of the Euphrates. Those works, however, Sir Henry Rawlinson

¹ Winckler, *Altorient. Forschungen*, 2te Reihe, Band ii. p. 206.

considers fictitious.¹ Nitocris, who is mentioned only by Herodotus, may have been the queen of Nebuchadnezzar. According to Herodotus, she entertained grave fears of the danger arising from Media, and (i. ch. 85) did what she could to guard Babylon against an invasion from that side. If she was a real historical character, and queen at the time when Nebuchadnezzar was afflicted with insanity, her wisdom may have been the means whereby the throne was kept secure for that monarch till the end of the fateful "seven years."

Professor W. H. Green (*General Introduction to the Old Testament*²) states that Nabû-na'id, in his coronation inscription,³ affirms that he was a "descendant" of Nebuchadnezzar and Neriglissor. The word used in the inscription referred to (as Professor Driver has pointed out⁴) is, however, *nashparu* (from *shaparu*, to send, delegate), *legate*, or *delegate*, not *descendant*.⁵ The Behistun inscription of Darius Hystaspes mentions a usurper of the name of Nadintabelus, who called himself Nebuchad-

¹ See the footnote in Canon Rawlinson's *Herodotus* (i. 185), and remarks in vol. i., Appendix P, p. 428.

² Murray, 1899.

³ Boscawen, *Bibl. and Orient. Record*, September 1896. The inscription was first translated by Schiel, *Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la Philologie et à l'Archéologie égypt. et assyr.*, vol. xviii. 1895.

⁴ Cambridge Bible, *Daniel*, Introd., p. li. note.

⁵ The words of the inscription cited by Driver are:—"I am the mighty legate of Nebuchadnezzar and Nergal-shar-uzur, the kings who walked before me. Their people are committed to my hand, their command I transgress not, their mind I obey. Amêl-Marduk and Lâbashi-Marduk . . . broke their commands." But this is not satisfactory evidence to establish the theory of no relationship at all. A son may be a delegate or legate of his father. Professor W. H. Green may have gone too far on the one side; Professor Driver has erred on the other. There is no evidence either one way or the other.

nezzar the son of Nabonidus (Nabû-na'id). That claimant was finally defeated by Darius in a great battle, after which Babylon was taken and the upstart slain. This is some evidence that Nebuchadnezzar was a name used in the family of Nabû-na'id; and the name was assumed not only by Nadintabelus, but also by other usurpers whose names are recorded on the Behistun inscription.

Nabû-na'id was a man of considerable powers. Dr Pinches considers his cylinder inscriptions prove him to have been one of the ablest men in Babylonia.¹ He reigned about sixteen years (the latest date of his reign is Kislev of his seventeenth year), and his inscriptions record the numerous temples which he restored or built. For reasons of which we know nothing, he seems to have deliberately eschewed residing in Babylon. His son was Belshazzar, mentioned in Dan. v. The latter is frequently mentioned by name in his father's inscriptions as "the king's son," but is never actually styled "king" in any inscriptions as yet discovered. He acted as viceroy at Babylon, and was well known and apparently popular as a general of the Babylonian army. As such, he may have been popularly regarded as king.² There is no evidence outside the Book of Daniel to show that he was actually made king in the latter years of Nabû-na'id's reign. But there is nothing improbable in the idea, when

¹ *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia* (London: S.P.C.K., 1902), p. 411.

² Winckler, in his *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, p. 316, remarks:—"Auch wird er [Belshazzar] in mehreren Inschriften seines Vaters in dem Schlussgebete mit genannt, während sonst der Name des Königs allein erwähnt wird. So erklärt es sich also leicht, wenn der späteren Sage, wie sie im Buche Daniel uns entgegentritt, Belsazar als der letzte König von Babylon galt."

the character and acts of Nabû-na'id are borne in mind. Schrader considers it likely that Belshazzar may have been called "king of Babylon." This is the more likely, because Cyrus made his son Cambyses "king of Babylon"; Cyrus, as suzerain, being recognised as "king of the lands," or "countries."¹ Hence mention is made naturally in Dan. vii. 1 of "the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon," and in Dan. viii. 1 of "the third year of king Belshazzar."² The fact that there is no direct evidence forthcoming of Belshazzar having been co-opted as king by his father presents no real difficulty.

The fact that Nabû-na'id never personally reigned in Babylon has led Winckler to conjecture that the secular party at Babylon had to some extent superseded his authority, and that Nabû-na'id was virtually a prisoner in their hands, while Belshazzar acted as the regent.³ Nabû-na'id seems, partially at least, to have been favourably disposed towards the priests, although in many things he offended them. His thoughts were mainly

¹ See Schrader, *K.A.T.* on Dan. v. 1.

² There are contract tablets dated "the first year of Cyrus king of countries, and of Cambyses king of Babylon." See *Crit. and Gramm. Comm.*, Appendix No. II. The phrase is varied in another similar tablet to "the first year of Cambyses king of Babylon, in the days of Cyrus his father, king of countries." See Maspero, *Passing of the Empires*, p. 636, referred to by Driver in the *Cambridge Bible Commentary on Daniel*, p. xxxii. See also Peiser, *Studium zum orient. Altertums-kunde*. The arrangement apparently lasted a year or two. Cyrus assumes to himself in the Annalistic Tablet the title of "king of Babylon." But the exact date at which that tablet was made is not absolutely clear. Winckler suggests that Cambyses was deposed by his father because of his disregard of native religions and customs, which afterwards caused such trouble in Egypt. See Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, 2te Reihe, Band ii. pp. 206 ff.

³ Winckler, as before, p. 200.

taken up with the erection of temples to the gods. But he appears to have had his eyes open to the dangers on the Babylonian frontiers from the people of the Manda, whether Medes themselves, or nomads occupying a part of Media. Ishtuvegu, or Astyages, was threatening with a numerous army the empire of Babylonia. Nabû-na'id, who imagined himself directed in a dream by Merodach to rebuild the temple of Sin at Sippara, implored that deity for assistance, pointing out to the god the impossibility of performing the task which the deity had appointed him. The god, in reply, assured him that within three years the impediment would be removed, and the Median power broken. Nabû-na'id accordingly summoned a vast army from Gaza, which performed the work of the restoration of the temple. The image of Sin was brought from Babylon and placed in its own temple at Sippara. Cyrus, whom Nabû-na'id at that time regarded as "the little servant of Merodach," defeated Astyages and broke up the power of the Medes. The Median army is said to have revolted against Astyages, and to have delivered that king into the hands of Cyrus.

Nabû-na'id, whether under compulsion or otherwise, continued to reside in Temâ or Tewâ, at a considerable distance from Babylon. The sacred festivals were therefore not held with their accustomed pomp and show, and the processions of the gods ceased. Belshazzar acted as the real ruler of the land. This was the state of affairs when Cyrus, who had carefully noted the trend of popular feeling, set out on his triumphal expedition against Babylon. Nabû-na'id was soon placed between two fires. Within the kingdom was treachery, without it was war. Belshazzar did what he could to keep the army on a proper footing, but, however brave he may have

been, he was unable to stop the triumphal progress of Cyrus.

It seems that there may have been some truth in the story of Cyrus having drained off the water of a river in order to take Babylon. The river which was drained off, however, lay far from the capital. The fact is not mentioned in the Annalistic Tablet. Cyrus advanced slowly, but deliberately. He waited till he had subdued the lands he had overrun. He closed, however, at last on his antagonist. All opposition in South Babylonia was soon overcome; and the Medo-Persian army in North Babylonia, despite of the solemn carrying in of the statues of the gods to Babylon, gained a decisive victory between Opis (Upî or Upia) and Sippara. Nabû-na'id took part in that battle. His soldiers, however, revolted against him, and he fled to Babylon, where he was captured "in a hiding-place" (*Cylinder Inscription*).

Thus Babylon was occupied "without fighting." Cyrus, on entering the city, proclaimed "peace" "to all Babylon." A portion of the city, probably the citadel, including the royal palace, held out for some time, being occupied by the army of Belshazzar. Driver's *Introduction to the Old Testament* (p. 499) states that Babylon was "in peaceable possession" of Cyrus "for four months" before Belshazzar was slain. The remark has been severely handled by Professor Green in his *General Introduction to the Old Testament*. Driver has modified the statement in his later *Commentary on Daniel*. Eduard Meyer, in the *Zeitschrift für Alt. Test. Wissenschaft* for 1898, has proved, by a careful examination of the dates given in the Tablet of Cyrus, compared with the dates contained in a record of Nabû-na'id, that Cyrus' entry into Babylon, and the capture of Nabû-na'id himself, did not (as stated on the

tablet) take place on the 16th Tammuz (July), but on the 16th Tishri (October 10). The error on the tablet was evidently an error of the engraver. Cyrus' triumphal entry took place on 3rd Marcheshwan (October 27), when he placed guards over the temples of the gods, and took all necessary measures to protect the city from plunder. Guburu, his commander-in-chief, was appointed by him governor of Babylon, and he appointed other subordinate governors. But whether those governors were appointed by Cyrus or by Gobryas is a matter of doubt. The inscription does not absolutely decide the point.¹ The people of Babylon received Cyrus with enthusiasm, for Nabû-na'id seems never to have been popular. Cyrus gained over to his side both the populace and the priests, and probably a portion even of the soldiery.

Seven days after Cyrus' triumphal entry—that is, somewhat less than a month after the actual capture of the city—Guburu stormed that part of Babylon which still held out against the Medo-Persian army. On that night (the 11th of Marcheshwan—November 4th) Belshazzar, “the king's son,” was slain. The record of Cyrus confirms the narrative of the last day of Babylon as it is depicted in Dan. v.

Winckler is wrong in stating that Belshazzar is represented in the Book of Daniel as killed in a drunken brawl (Winckler, Band ii. p. 213). The Book of Daniel insinuates nothing of the kind. It simply asserts that Belshazzar was slain on the night of the fatal banquet. Whether he perished bravely fighting at the head of his

¹ In Dr Pinches' first translation (*Journal of Soc. of Bibl. Archæology*, part iii., 1880) it is stated that Cyrus appointed the governors. In order to obtain that sense an “and” had to be inserted. If the passage be translated literally, Gobryas seems to have appointed the governors.

soldiers, or whether they mutinied against him as they had done against his father, does not appear.

The attentive reader cannot fail to have noticed how modern scholars have been obliged, in order to make a connected history, to fill up by conjecture the gaps in the story which exist both on the Annalistic Tablet of Cyrus and in the Cylinder Inscription. The scholar who believes in the credibility of Daniel's account must, to some extent, have recourse also to conjecture. It is, however, something to be able to rebut the attacks of the modern critics, although we cannot claim (as has been in some cases boastfully done) to demolish the entire argument of the critics. There is no real evidence which can be adduced to prove that Belshazzar was an actual descendant of Nebuchadnezzar. It is, however, highly probable that Belshazzar may have been so descended. For, like Neriglissor, Nabû-na'id would naturally have sought to strengthen his position by intermarriage with the old royal stock ; and it is admitted on the other side that there is no evidence to show that he did *not* so ally himself.

As to the feast itself, so vividly described in this chapter of Daniel, there is nothing, apart from the story of the handwriting on the wall, which ought to present any difficulty to a historical critic of the broadest school of thought.

The great palace of Babylon and the portion of the city which it commanded was (as Cyrus' tablets lead us to believe) the rallying-place for the Babylonian army in command of Belshazzar. There is nothing to enable a critic to infer what the strength of that army may have been ; it undoubtedly contained good fighting material. Nor is there anything to show that the army within the

citadel was acquainted with the capture of the defeated king. It can easily be understood, from many a modern parallel, that a resolute commander like Belshazzar would determine to hold out to the last. Cyrus' victories up to that time had not been gained by hard fighting, but mainly by internal revolution, even in the ranks of the fighting men.

The Jewish nation, although it may not have taken any part in those revolutionary movements, must have been disposed to favour the cause of Cyrus. If that nation had even a rudimentary acquaintance with the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah, it might well look upon the events which were occurring on all sides with keen interest, and be inclined, from patriotic motives, to welcome the conqueror of Babylon. Tolerant as Cyrus had already proved himself to be to all religions and nationalities, he would be understood to be ready to espouse even the Jewish cause. It was a day in which redemption must have been looked for in Israel, the last of the nations crushed under the hoof of Babylon. The temple of the God of gods and Israel's national God had been destroyed by the victorious armies of the Chaldeans seventy years before. The victory over Israel had often been treated as a victory over Jehovah.

To encourage his soldiers in their struggle with the Medo-Persian foe, Belshazzar considered it fit to make a magnificent banquet. He was in possession of the treasures that had been carried off from Jerusalem. At his feast, therefore, Belshazzar sought to remind his warriors of the old campaigns which their forefathers fought, when they had trodden down the people of Jehovah as the mire in the streets. There was still a

Jewish monarch living in retirement in Babylon, whom a Babylonian king had in good-natured simplicity rescued from prison, and had set his throne above the throne of the other vassal kings that were with him at Babylon (2 Kings xxv. 28).

Hence, appealing to the feelings of the old Chaldean soldiery, and to the inclinations of the nobility of Babylon, who had retired for safety to the palace-citadel, Belshazzar made the feast, and, amid the applause of a thousand courtiers and army commanders, "drank wine before the thousand." His conduct was not that of a drunken debauchee, but of a cool politician, when he commanded the sacred vessels of the Temple of Jerusalem to be brought into the hall of feasting, that his wives, concubines, and princes might remember the successful campaign in which the independence of Judah had been crushed.

It was a suitable occasion for a grand wonder of Divine power to be manifested, more significant than even an earthquake destroying the proud boasters. A man's hand appeared high above the cornice of the banquetting chamber, and wrote silently the doom of the empire and the destruction of that proud race which had levelled the walls of Jerusalem.

The consternation produced by the sight is best described in the sacred narrative itself. The conviction that there was a world above the present changeable scene forced itself into the hearts of those revellers. The cry and consternation of the guests soon brought the queen-mother into the hall of banquetting. If she had been the wife of Nebuchadnezzar, she must have remembered how the God of heaven could abase the proud and exalt the lowly. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary,

we are quite justified in suspecting that she—the queen-mother—was Nitocris, who had proved herself to be a wise empress of Babylon.

Belshazzar and his soldiers might well have imagined that the palace-citadel was impregnable. The position was no doubt a strong one; and it might be taken for granted that the Chaldean soldiers, under the immediate eye of their king or crown prince, would fight desperately when driven to bay. There is nothing improbable in a monarch under such circumstances continuing to “promise and dispense honours.” Belshazzar may have honestly believed that he would ultimately prove successful in the struggle.

The meaning of the phrase rendered “the third ruler in the kingdom” is best discussed in the *Critical Commentary*. The Aramaic word only occurs in this single passage, and therefore modern scholars are not justified in their assertions that the old translation is certainly ungrammatical, and that the conclusion drawn from that long-admitted translation in favour of the history of the Book of Daniel ought to be abandoned.

The ancient translation of MENI, MENI, TEKEL, U-PHARSIN, “*Numbered, numbered, weighed, and divided,*” ought still to be upheld as the true rendering of the words of doom. The modern version of some critics—which is not by any means agreed upon by all—“*A mina, a mina, a shekel, and half minas*”—might be defensible if suggested as the rendering of a newly discovered inscription, but it cannot be proved to be the true rendering of the phrase in the Book of Daniel.¹ It is quite true, even if that rendering were proved to demonstration, that the historical character of the story would remain

¹ See *Critical Commentary*.

unaffected. But it is also true that no such translation would ever have entered the head of those who believed in the historical fact, and in the Divine inspiration of the book. The meaning of such a phrase could never have suggested itself to the onlookers at the feast, and further, the exposition which Daniel gave of its significance loses considerably in importance if such an artificial interpretation could be established beyond question.

§ 2. *Darius the Mede, and Daniel in the Lions' Den*

Closely connected with the history of Belshazzar and his fatal banquet stands the great historical "crux" of the Book of Daniel, namely, the mention of "Darius the Mede." No monarch of that name is alluded to by any ancient historians. The name does not occur in any inscription yet discovered. The monarch intended by Daniel may, however, possibly have been known by another name. This is the first point of inquiry.

It would be strange, even on the assumption that the Book of Daniel contained fictitious history, that its writer should have spoken of an independent kingdom of the Medians being in existence between the downfall of Babylon and the reign of Cyrus. For the writer was acquainted with the Books of the Chronicles and Ezra, and therefore knew that the kingdom of the Babylonians was immediately followed by the kingdom of the Medo-Persians under the sovereignty of Cyrus. The Median kingdom supposed to have been mentioned by Daniel as succeeding immediately to that of Babylon is an invention of modern critics; who, on the strength of their invention, have charged the sacred writer with having made divers and sundry historical blunders. Even if some of Daniel's historical narratives

could be proved to be mere romance, the writer knew too much of the actual history of the great Eastern monarchies to represent "Darius the Mede" as a sovereign of Babylon wholly independent of Cyrus. If "Darius the Mede" be spoken of as the king of Babylon who "received the kingdom" when the city of Babylon fell into the hands of Cyrus, the writer must have considered Darius a vassal monarch under the suzerainty of Cyrus. Cyrus was a monarch not unknown to the writer, for he mentions him three times by name (i. 21, vi. 28, x. 1).

"Darius the Mede" is mentioned in four places of the book, namely, in Dan. v. 21, in ch. vi., and again in ch. ix. 1 and ch. x. 1. The arguments adduced against his identification with Astyages, the king of Media, who was overthrown by Cyrus, appear conclusive. It was formerly held that Darius the Mede was the son of that Astyages, and was uncle to Cyrus. That opinion rests upon a conjecture of Josephus, and upon the history set forth in the *Cyropædia* of Xenophon. Xenophon's work is, however, regarded by modern scholars as a historical romance, although it may contain not a few historical facts.

In Cyrus' account of the capture of Babylon, Guburu, or Gobryas, is stated to have been the commander who led the soldiers of Cyrus, "without fighting," into Babylon, and afterwards took by storm the palace or citadel defended by Belshazzar. The name given by Xenophon to that commander in the *Cyropædia* is Gobryas.

Gobryas, according to that historian, was an Assyrian of noble position, who joined Cyrus' army on account of the murder of his own son by the king of Babylon. Gobryas was favourably received, and his soldiers fought as allies in the army of Cyrus. Xenophon represents him as an old man, but one able to do good service at the head of

the cavalry. He is represented by that historian as one of the two commanders who stormed Babylon, and as the chieftain who slew its king in the royal palace. Xenophon's statement about Gobryas' share in the death of the king of Babylon is confirmed by the Tablet of Cyrus. Gobryas is spoken of in the Annalistic Tablet of Cyrus as having been governor of Gutium, in Kurdistan, and therefore might be regarded as a Median. He is afterwards spoken of as governor of Babylon.

Dr Pinches has, therefore, with considerable probability, conjectured that Gobryas was "Darius the Mede." Although Xenophon speaks of him as an Assyrian by birth, he certainly was in command of the Median forces, and connected with Media. He might have been rewarded for the successful capture of Babylon, and for the invaluable help afforded to Cyrus in the campaign, by receiving the position and dignity of vassal "king of Babylon." Cyrus, of course, retained his position as "king of kings" or "king of countries." The Book of Daniel states that after the death of Belshazzar "Darius the Median *received* (לָקַח) the kingdom." The Aramaic verb implies that Darius received the crown from some superior power (see *Critical Commentary*).¹ The expression used later (ch. ix. 1) also suggests that Darius had over him a suzerain lord, for it is: "Darius the Mede, who was made king over the kingdom of the Chaldeans."² All those statements fall in with the hypothesis that Darius, whoever he may have been, was made king over Babylonia by Cyrus, who was the supreme monarch of the Medes and Persians, and king

¹ The Authorised English Version "took the kingdom" is incorrect. The Revised Version has correctly "*received the kingdom*."

² See *Critical Commentary* on ch. ix. 1.

over the lands which had been conquered. It is quite true that "contemporary monuments allow no room for a king between the entry of Babylon by Cyrus and the reign of Cyrus himself" (*Driver*). But the writer of the Book of Daniel has not interposed any such monarch; and Professor Driver's statement is not inconsistent with the hypothesis that "Darius the Mede" was a vassal king under the supreme suzerainty of Cyrus.

The phrase used in Cyrus' Annalistic Tablet, "he appointed governors in Babylon," which, in the context in which it is found, may refer either to Cyrus or Guburu, may be connected with the statement in Daniel that Darius set over the whole kingdom "one hundred and twenty princes" (Dan. vi. 1). No stress, however, must be laid upon such a possibility.

It has been argued that Guburu is nowhere distinctly styled "king"; and the same objection has been urged against Belshazzar's royalty. Some arrangement may have been made in the case both of the one and the other, and in either case the arrangement may have been only provisional.

There are, however, contract tablets in existence which speak of Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, being "king of Babylon" in the first year of Cyrus. And those tablets state that Cyrus retained the title of "king of countries" or "lands," indicating that the supreme rule was still in his hands.¹

¹ See *Critical Commentary*, and Appendix on Babylonian Contract Tablets. Dr Pinches (*The Old Testament*, etc., p. 424) writes as if this association of Cambyses as king with his father took place B.C. 530. Cyrus' death occurred in B.C. 529. In that case "the first year" would be the first year of Cambyses' reign, and not of Cyrus. Winckler, on the other hand, maintains that Cambyses was made king in the first year of Cyrus after the capture of Babylon.

Cambyses was thus made "king of Babylon" a short time after the city had been taken, and things were being set in order under the new rule of Cyrus. Winckler, an eminent Assyriologist (whose views as to the Book of Daniel in general harmonise with those of the majority of modern critics) argues that there are a number of historical facts contained in Daniel, although, in Winckler's opinion, those facts are mixed up with matter wholly legendary. That scholar maintains that Cambyses was the personage styled in Daniel as "Darius the Mede."¹

On the assumption that Winckler is correct, there is a contract tablet to prove that Cambyses was made "king of Babylon" by Cyrus. But there is no proof, as Winckler seems to argue, that the proclamation of the sovereignty of Cyrus mentioned in line 12 of the Cylinder Inscription was a resumption by Cyrus of the power granted for a time to Cambyses.

The statement in Dan. v. 30 that the age at which "Darius the Mede" "received the kingdom" was sixty-two is not in harmony with Winckler's conclusions. The LXX. read in Dan. v. 30: "and Artaxerxes, who belonged to the Medes, received the kingdom," and that version omits the precise specification of his age. In the LXX. version of ch. ix. 1 Artaxerxes is mentioned as father of Darius. The name Darius occurs in the LXX. throughout ch. vi., and ch. vi. 1 in that version is the

The names of Cyrus and Cambyses are not united in any tablets yet known to have been made in the "accession year" of Cyrus, which included the months from Marchesvan to Nisan.

¹ Winckler, *Altorient. Forschungen*, 2te Reihe, Band ii. pp. 214, 215. It should be remembered that many gaps, some small, some larger, make it difficult to give a connected history. Modern scholars have in many cases, without any warning, not scrupled to fill up those gaps according to their individual fancy.

conclusion of ch. v. 30. In Dan. vi. 1, however, Darius is stated in the LXX. to have been a man of years and well advanced in age. Jahn gets rid of the difficulty regarding ch. v. 31 in the LXX. by supposing it to be a later interpolation. Anyhow, the numeral is somewhat doubtful (see *Critical Commentary*). If the present Book of Daniel be supposed to consist of extracts from a larger work, one need not be surprised to meet with such difficulties, which cannot be cleared up in our present state of knowledge.

The mention of the precise age of Darius at his elevation to the throne (in the Aramaic text) is, indeed, difficult to account for. Conjectures as to the reading of the Massoretic text will be found in the *Critical Commentary*. Winckler's attempt to make out in the numeral a reference to the sixty-two years of the prophecy of "the seventy weeks" (Dan. ix.) has nothing to recommend it.¹

If Cambyses be "Darius the Mede," whose reign is spoken of alongside that of "Cyrus the Persian" in ch. vi. 28, the narrative of ch. vi. corresponds well with what is known of that erratic monarch, whose epileptic fits during his father's lifetime, and mad acts in Egypt after his father's death, brought confusion and disaster upon the new empire of the Medes and Persians.

Darius, on his elevation, proceeded to appoint subordinate governors or satraps in Babylonia. The number 120 (Dan. vi. 1) presents no difficulty. Winckler, indeed, arbitrarily changes that figure into 127, to make it correspond with Esth. i. 1. Over those governors or satraps were placed three presidents, of whom Daniel was one (see *Critical Commentary*).

¹ See Winckler, *Altorient. Forschungen*, 2te Reihe, Band iii. pp. 437-440.

It was probably on the proclamation of the new "king of Babylon" that the presidents and princes, in order to eject Daniel from his lofty position, agreed to recommend to the king, in honour of his accession to royalty, and therefore claiming a Divine position, to forbid all public prayer or petitions to be made to any god or man for thirty days. It is, of course, absurd (even were the story the wildest romance) to suppose that such a prohibition extended to those common requests which in private life are absolutely unavoidable. The older "depravers" of the Book of Daniel have exhibited on the latter point an unscientific disposition to cast ridicule upon the book.

Darius well knew that as "king of Babylon" he would be regarded as a Divine incarnation. He therefore readily consented to accept the proffered mark of respect, and to sign the writing and interdict. He never dreamed that any danger could accrue from it to his favourite Daniel.

But Darius was soon undeceived. The Jewish prophet disregarded the interdict, and continued his daily devotions to the God of Israel, the God of the whole earth, in the manner in which he had ever been wont to worship his Creator. His enemies found no difficulty in discovering Daniel actually engaged in prayer, with his window open in the direction of Jerusalem.

Dens of lions were commonly attached to the residences of the kings of Assyria, Babylon, and Persia. Those who do not believe in a personal God, who in days gone by was wont to perform wonders on fitting occasions, will always experience a difficulty in accepting the statement in the narrative that the angel of Jahveh prevented the lions from hurting the prophet.

One point connected with the story calls for a passing notice. It has been argued that verse 24 states that, after Daniel had been taken up out of the den, all the 120 persons, with their families, were thrown into the den of lions, and it has been said that 400 persons at least are here represented as put to death. But the statement is founded upon an unnatural interpretation. All that the verse asserts is that Daniel's accusers and their families were so punished. Those who suffered were, comparatively speaking, a small number. The accusers of Daniel were probably few, and the deputation which waited on the king to require the enforcement of the decree probably consisted of even fewer persons. The children and the wives punished on the occasion were probably foremost in demanding the execution of the man whose God they despised and whose religion they hated. The text states that the accusers and their families, when hurled into the den, were at once caught by the lions, and immediately devoured, which would have been impossible to conceive had the persons cast into the den numbered 300 or 400. Common sense, with a reasonable allowance for the language used in relating such events, is certainly required in order rightly to understand even the sacred Scriptures.

If Lenormant be correct in concluding that "Darius the Mede" was only two years on his titular throne (and Winckler makes a similar calculation), it can easily be understood that Cyrus found it necessary, after permitting the occupant of the throne of Babylon to enjoy for a season the sweets of royalty, to remove him from that position, lest the indignation of the people might break forth against such a "cruel lord," and endanger the quiet of the Persian empire.

CHAPTER V

THE PROPHECIES OF THE FOUR KINGDOMS

CRITICS are generally unanimous in maintaining that both chs. ii. and vii. speak of the same events, although the details concerning the fourth kingdom in the seventh chapter are fuller than those in ch. ii., and some points mentioned in the first prophecy are passed over without notice in the second.

Nebuchadnezzar saw in his dream a colossal image composed of various metals. The head was of fine gold, the breast and arms of silver, the body and thighs of brass. The legs were of iron, but the feet and toes on which the image stood were formed partly of iron and partly of clay.¹ A stone "cut out of the mountain without hands," *i.e.* without any human agency, suddenly smote the colossus upon the feet upon which it was standing. The blow broke the image into pieces, and the broken pieces became "like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth."

The dream of Nebuchadnezzar was a parable of the world-power and its opposition to God. The king, when

¹ *Clay* is used in five places in the narrative without any qualifying expression. In one place (ver. 41) it is defined as *potters' clay*. In two other places (vers. 41, 43) it is *earthen clay*, clay of potters' earth. The "*miry clay*" of the A.V. gives a wrong impression.

he saw the vision, was musing over what would happen after death (ch. ii. 29). The Babylonian empire, brought by him to its highest point of greatness, formed a part of a world-power antagonistic to God and His kingdom. That power, under Nebuchadnezzar's leadership, had crushed under foot, as "a very little thing," the small but divinely established kingdom of Judah, with its Davidic monarchy. Nebuchadnezzar was the supreme monarch of an empire "mad upon idols" (Jer. i. 38). He beheld in the visions of the night, when God speaketh unto men (Job xxxiii. 14, 15), a mighty image representing his kingdom and his gods shivered by Divine power. The dream was particularly calculated to arouse the attention of a monarch at whose court the representatives of the fallen theocracy of Israel were then captives and slaves.

The ancient traditional interpretation explains the kingdoms indicated by the colossus to be the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman—the latter depicted under two phases, a stronger and a weaker. Modern scholars strike out the Roman. They fill up the number four in two different ways: (1) by subdividing the Medo-Persian into two distinct empires, the Median and the Persian; or (2) by subdividing the Macedonian empire into two, regarding the empire of Alexander as a radically different kingdom from that of the Diadochi or Alexander's "successors." The latter exposition, however, is now generally abandoned.

The solitary instance in which the LXX. translators have indicated their own interpretation is in ch. ii. 41,¹

¹ The LXX. translate the verse:—"And as thou sawest the feet of it and the toes, some part indeed (*μέρος μὲν τι*) of potters' clay, but some part (*μέρος δέ τι*) of iron, there will be in it another kingdom of two parts (*βασιλεία ἄλλη διαμερῆς ἔσται ἐν αὐτῇ*)."

where they appear to have interpreted the prophecy to refer to the division of part of the Macedonian empire between the Seleucidæ and the Ptolemies.

Notes on the interpretation are given in the text of the Peschitto Syriac. No such notes occur in ch. ii. But in ch. vii. there are many, which in the MSS. are distinguished from the original by the colour of the ink. These notes are found in the text of the London Polyglot, but are not given in the edition of Lee. According to the interpretations set forth in those notes, the first kingdom represents the Babylonians, the second the Medes, the third the Persians, the fourth the Greeks. The kingdom of the little horn (included under the former) is explained of "Antiochus," *i.e.* Epiphanes.

All attempts to add to the symbolism mentioned in Daniel's account of Nebuchadnezzar's dream itself, or set forth in the prophet's interpretation, ought, in the interests of strict Biblical exegesis, to be set aside. Dr Pusey among the English interpreters, and J. C. K. Hofmann of Erlangen among the German, are notable transgressors in this particular. Not satisfied with the explanation given on the sacred page, they maintain that "the symbol represented much more." Expositors of Daniel ought to keep imagination under control, and not leap over the hedge into the flowery meadow of fancy.

The image beheld by the king was of human form. The division into four parts, given in ch. ii., is the only natural fourfold division which could have been made. No symbolical meanings ought to be assigned to any portion of that image, except such as are specially indicated by Daniel. It is wrong to invent reasons why one kingdom is symbolised by the head, and another by the belly. The expositions are equally fanciful which

assign symbolical significations to the right and left sides of the body, or interpret as significant such details as the two arms connected by the chest, the ten fingers, two thighs, the two legs, or even the ten toes. Not a single one of those features is referred to in ch. ii. as having had any symbolical meaning.

The metals of various kinds, like the colours of the horses in Zechariah's vision (ch. i. 8),¹ were designed only to draw attention to the fourfold division of the colossus. The colours or peculiarities of the several metals have no symbolical import. The second kingdom is distinctly stated to be inferior to the first. That inferiority was not necessarily indicated by the portion of the image representing it being silver instead of gold. The metals gold, silver, brass, and iron seem to have been chosen as metals in common use, not because of their relative value. The iron is, indeed, expounded as indicating *strength*, but nothing more, and the writer of the book calls distinct attention to that point.² The plasticity of potters' clay is not the real point of comparison, but its brittleness. The want of cohesion and strength in the mixture of iron and potters' clay is expounded as having a distinct meaning.

Although the vision of the great colossus in ch. ii. is parallel with that of the four wild beasts in ch. vii.,

¹ See the *Bampton Lectures on Zechariah*.

² The different metals have also been explained as denoting the gradual deterioration in morals of the several world-powers. An effort has been made also to trace such deterioration in the wild beasts of ch. vii. But although the second kingdom, as portrayed in the colossus, is distinctly stated to be inferior in power to the first, no similar statement is made of the third or the fourth kingdom. All such interpretations must therefore be regarded as fancies of interpreters. They have no real basis in the statements of Daniel.

features peculiar to the one are not to be introduced into the other according to the fancy of commentators. Each of the two visions is accompanied by an interpretation in which the special symbols are severally explained. In visions, as in parables, there are features which belong purely to the framework of the story, and which are not in themselves symbolical. Although the two visions cover the same period of history, the period so comprehended is viewed from different standpoints. Details mentioned in the one are not always to be found in the other, and we must be careful not to dress up one vision with the characteristics which belong to the other. If the narrative in which the visions are embedded is to be regarded as having any relation to the visions, each vision ought to be interpreted in the light of its own peculiar surroundings.

The expositions (however respectable by reason of antiquity) must be set aside which regard the union of the kingdoms of Media and Persia in one common empire with their relative subordination to be represented by the two arms of the image united together in the chest. For similar reasons, the expositions of eminent modern critics, according to which the two legs are supposed to indicate "the often externally allied, but yet inwardly disunited, empires of the Diadochi," or the Eastern and Western divisions of the Roman empire, must be abandoned. All such expositions of arms, thighs, or legs, whether propounded by Church Fathers, critics, or apologists of the book, are simply fancies of individual interpreters, and find no real support in the language of the book.

The vision of the seventh chapter was seen in the first year of Belshazzar, and was written down on that occasion (ver. 1). The date will be found discussed elsewhere. According to ver. 1, Daniel, in writing the account of

his dream, gave the main substance of the words, *i.e.* set forth the general import of the vision.

In the dream the prophet beheld the four winds of heaven bursting forth in the direction of the great sea,¹ *i.e.* the Mediterranean. Four great beasts arose from that sea, differing one from the other. The Mediterranean Sea was that evidently in the prophet's mind, although the point is not to be unduly pressed. Places and localities in ordinary dreams appear often strangely altered, and are combined with features which sometimes do not belong to the particular localities. Observation of the ordinary phenomena of dreams will often materially help one to understand the sense of divinely-sent visions. Daniel's thoughts ran, more or less, on his own people and his own land. The four beasts were beheld by him emerging from the billows of that sea around whose shores many of those conflicts took place which resulted in Israel being transferred from bondage under one empire to bondage under another.

¹ "The great sea" is the Mediterranean. See Numbers xxxiv. 6, 7; Josh. xv. 12; Ezek. xlvii. 20, etc. It was ever present to the sight and mind of the Hebrew writers. Of its storms the Psalmist speaks: "The floods have lifted up, Jehovah, the floods have lifted up their voice; the floods lift up their roaring. More than the voices of many waters, the glorious breakers of the sea, glorious in the height is Jehovah" (Ps. xciii. 3, 4). Isaiah speaks of the heathen nations being like the waves of that mighty sea, which ever appeared threatening to overwhelm the Holy Land and its inhabitants, but was driven back by the rebuke of God (Isa. xvii. 12, 13). In the midst of that sea, the prophets speak of the great "sea-monster" Egypt, as the enemy of the Lord's people (Isa. xxvii. 1, li. 9; Ezek. xxix. 3 ff., xxxii. 2; Ps. lxxiv. 13, 14), which monster the Lord would slay in due season. The wicked are compared to that troubled sea in Isa. lvii. 20. In the exposition of the vision of Daniel which follows, the beasts (spoken of in ver. 2) are in ver. 17 with equal propriety said to arise "from the earth."

Although the four beasts, according to ver. 3, might (had ver. 3 stood alone) be supposed to have arisen contemporaneously from the stormy waters, the verses that follow show that those beasts did not rise together, but rose up one after the other.

The first was like a lion, furnished, however, with the wings of an eagle. The LXX. and Theodotion have translated *lioness*, and so has Jerome in his Commentary. Jerome thinks that the lioness was chosen because it is more cruel than the lion. Hence the Vulgate preserves that rendering. Nestle asks whether the translators of the LXX., in their rendering, had any conception in their minds of the Egyptian Sphinx. The idea is most improbable. Those translators were probably led astray by the feminine verbs and suffixes following, which are employed because the word for "beast" is feminine.¹ The symbols of the lion and eagle combined are expressive of great fierceness and power. The Babylonian power is likened by Jeremiah to a lion (ch. xlix. 19), and of that lion it was said: "He shall come up and fly as the eagle, and spread out his wings" (ch. xlix. 22). The lion with eagles' wings was a symbol earlier than the time of Daniel.

Such considerations must be excluded as that introduced by Jerome, that the eagle is long-lived, and the Assyrians accordingly bore rule for ages. That great Church

¹ נִיָּו, *beast*, is properly speaking, *animal*, ζῷον. Auberlen supposes the four beasts of ch. vii. to be the counterparts of the four living beings described in Ezekiel. The date of Ezekiel's vision was more than thirty years earlier than Daniel's vision of ch. vii. Hence it is possible that his four living beings may have been known to Daniel. But no such statement can be proved as that the four living creatures of Ezekiel, like the living beings of the Apocalypse, represent the life of the world as directed towards God, while the four wild beasts depict the life of the world as directed against God.

Father was not the only interpreter of Daniel who has confounded the kingdom of the Assyrians with that of the Babylonians. Dr Pusey has, however, satisfactorily shown that Assyrian human-headed winged lions are not to be identified with the eagle-winged lion of Daniel.

The first beast was soon forcibly restrained by a power from above. For as the prophet gazed at the monster, "its wings were plucked off, and it was lifted up from the earth." An invisible hand appears to have seized hold of the animal by its wings, lifted it up from the earth, and thus rendered it powerless. The wings were plucked off in the struggle, and "it was made to stand upon two feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it."

No interpretation is vouchsafed of this strange symbol. But, if the story of Nebuchadnezzar in the book be founded on fact, Nebuchadnezzar's history may have been viewed in an allegorical as well as in a historical light. The golden head of the great colossus which the monarch beheld in vision represented the Babylonian empire and the king who had raised it to the summit of glory. The eagle-winged lion may also have depicted both the monarch and his kingdom. The madness of Nebuchadnezzar (ch. iv.) was not merely a striking incident in the history of the king, but an allegorical picture of the world-power as "beside itself" owing to its estrangement from God. The "seven times" may represent not only the seven years of the king's insanity, but the great prophetic "seven times" which span the period between the overthrow of the Jewish theocracy by the Babylonian monarch and the day when the Messiah shall be revealed as King of kings and Lord of lords.

Hence it may be natural to trace in the words, "it was

made to stand upon two feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it," an allusion, on the one hand (possibly, though not probably), to the gradual humanising of the Babylonians after their fall from power; and on the other, to the story of the recovery from madness of their greatest monarch. The Babylonian empire, and the two succeeding empires, are regarded in ver. 12 as lasting on to the end of the age. "As for the rest of the beasts, their dominion was taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a season and a time." The first three empires are therefore regarded not merely from a historical but also from an allegorical point of view. Hence the judgment passed upon those empires differs widely from that passed upon the fourth empire.

The renderings of the LXX. of the three opening verses do not here require special notice. As to the translation, "*made to stand upon two feet as a man,*" Behrmann maintains that the Aramaic noun is to be regarded, not as a dual, but as a plural.¹ It is, therefore, not so certain as some have imagined that the eagle-winged lion is represented as standing on *two* feet in place of *four*. The words may simply describe the winged lion as no longer able to soar as an eagle above the earth, but compelled to keep on the ground and walk after the fashion of men.

The second monster was like a bear, "and it lifted itself up on one side," as if rising from a reclining posture and preparing to attack another animal. "There were three ribs in its mouth between its teeth," represented as if torn from the side of an animal on which it had been feasting; "and they were thus saying to it, Lift up thyself, devour much flesh."

¹ See *Critical Commentary* on ch. vii. 4.

The three ribs were a portion of a carcase which had not been wholly devoured. The bear is portrayed as stirred from the partial inactivity into which it was disposed to relapse after obtaining food, by the voice of persons inciting it to lift itself up and devour "much flesh," instead of contentedly gnawing that already in its mouth. The *ribs* are not represented as speaking—an incongruous idea, though strangely acquiesced in by a host of interpreters.¹ The three ribs cannot, therefore, indicate Babylonia, Egypt, and Syria, which were conquered by the Medo-Persians. Jerome strangely expounds them of Babylon, Media, and Persia. Expositors have forgotten that the three ribs in the picture must be the ribs of one and the same animal, and not ribs of three different animals. The number *three* is employed as a round number to indicate plurality (see p. 159). The straining after explanations of details only mentioned to give life to the picture, is a common failing in interpreters of all schools of thought.

Dr Pusey affirms (p. 72) that "*the three ribs in its* (the bear's) *mouth* correspond accurately to the three kingdoms which the Medo-Persian empire swallowed up, the Lydian, Babylonian, Egyptian." It is strange that he did not see that ribs in an animal's mouth, and as yet between its teeth, cannot be said to have been "swallowed up." It is useless to speak of accurate correspondence, when there is no agreement as to what are the three particular kingdoms referred to. On that point even "orthodox" commentators differ. Ewald maintains that, as a large kingdom comprehending many lands is represented

¹ The participle in ch. vii. 5 is to be explained impersonally, as in chs. iii. 4 and iv. 28. Compare the same usage in chs. iii. 3 and iv. 22.

by a great beast, so the separate lands may be represented as its bones or ribs. That is not a correct statement of the facts. The countries belonging to the territory of an empire, if that empire be symbolised by a beast, may be represented as ribs or bones. Ribs torn from another animal's side, and in the mouth of a devouring beast, cannot with any propriety be explained as symbols of parts of the empire represented by that devouring animal.

Nor is a symbolical significance to be attached to the bear raising up one side above another.¹ A bear does so when rising from the ground, and when in the attitude of attack. The attempts to explain as symbolical the elevation of the one side above the other, or to prop up that interpretation by imaginary differences between the right and left sides of the great image, are instances of "sacred trifling."² The voice which called upon the bear, disposed to content itself with the ribs in its mouth, to "arise, and devour much flesh," was a Divine call to the empire to execute the task which it had been raised up to perform.

The second beast signified the Medo-Persian empire. The idea that that beast represents the Median empire, prior to the fusion of the Medes and Persians, is built

¹ Dean Farrar is wrong when he affirms, "The crouching on one side is obscure. It is explained by some as implying that it was lower in exaltation than the Babylonian empire; by others that it gravitated, as regards its power, only towards the countries west of the Tigris and Euphrates (*Ewald*)."

² So Pusey, p. 66, writes:—"The form, moreover, in the human figure is twofold; not only so, but the right is stronger than the left. The kingdom, then, which was to succeed Nebuchadnezzar's was not only to be inferior to it, but was to be compounded of two parts, the one stronger than the other." Still more fanciful is Hofmann in *Weissagung u. Erfüllung*, 1ste Hälfte, 278, 279.

upon the sandy foundation of the mention of "Darius the Mede" receiving the kingdom on the occasion of the death of Belshazzar. The question of "Darius the Mede" has been discussed in the former chapter. In the record, however, of ch. vi., which speaks of Darius' kingdom, whether an independent or a vassal throne, "the law of the Medes and Persians" is spoken of as one and the same. The assertions of Dean Farrar and others, that, according to "the plain indications of the book itself, the author regards the Median and Persian empires as distinct," are opposed by the very passages cited as proof-texts.

There is much in Dr Pusey's work which has been left unnoticed by later critics. The empire of the Medes, as known to history, had little connection with the people of Israel, and a writer with such historical information as is exhibited in the Book of Daniel (even on the assumption of some historical discrepancies) was not ignorant of the fact that the empire of Babylon was put an end to by Cyrus, who was the founder of the united Medo-Persian empire. That fact is distinctly mentioned in Ezra, which cannot be placed as late as the Maccabean era.

The third monster was a leopard, or panther. The strict zoological designation of the particular animal need not be discussed. It is convenient to designate it as *leopard*, because it is thus translated in the A.V. and R.V. Daniel's leopard had four heads, and four wings of a fowl upon its back.

The third beast represented the Greek or Macedonian empire. Even Porphyry explained the third beast of Alexander, and considered the fourth beast to be the Greek empire under the Diadochi. Unfortunately,

Porphyry's detailed exposition of the third beast is not extant, and we only know this isolated fact from the Commentary of Jerome. Porphyry did not, however, dream of the modern invention of a Median empire. The Macedonian empire was divided into four kingdoms during the larger part of its history. That characteristic of the Greek empire is indicated by the beast having four heads. The symbol cannot mean (as Ewald, Bevan, and others explain it) four kings who succeeded one another (see *Critical Commentary* on ch. viii.). It indicates four permanent divisions in the empire symbolised. When the historical fact had to be set forth that the Macedonian empire at the beginning was ruled over by one king, and after the death of that king the empire was divided into four parts, the symbol had to be changed, and horns were substituted in the place of heads, as in the vision of ch. viii. Horns can, with propriety, be described as falling off, broken, or uprooted. No such language, however, can be employed of the heads of an animal. The four wings of a fowl on the back of the third beast point to the fourfold character of the empire, combined with the further idea of swiftness and activity.

While the fourfold character of the Macedonian empire is a historical fact (admittedly referred to in the symbols used in ch. viii.), no such characteristic can be pointed out in the Persian empire, which many modern scholars maintain to be meant by the third beast. Critics therefore have attempted to explain the four heads of four successive Persian monarchs. Behrmann has rightly pronounced the solution untenable. For the heads on the animal's body are not represented as succeeding one another, but as contemporaneous. Behrmann's own explanation is vaguely indefinite, namely, that both the four wings and

the four heads were designed to describe the extension of the kingdom on all sides.

Failing to discover, on their hypothesis, any rational explanation of the symbols employed, some critics maintain that the writer of Daniel made use of "oracularly obscure language" in order to pass off his writings as genuine prophecies. Thus, scholars who commenced their critical examination of the Hebrew prophets by decrying "traditional" interpretations, now, to use the language of one of themselves, seek by such devices to uphold "the explanations which have become traditional among liberal critics" (*Cheyne*).

The fourth beast is described as "fearful, *terror-inspiring*, and strong exceedingly. It had great teeth of iron; it devoured, and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with its feet." Its nails, or claws, were of brass or bronze, (ver. 19). It was diverse from the three beasts that were before it. It had on its head ten horns (ver. 20). Daniel's monster had only one head, not seven heads, like the beast of Rev. xiii.

As the prophet gazed on the fourth monster, his attention was riveted by its ten horns. Among these he perceived another little horn (an eleventh) coming up. The rise of that little horn uprooted three of the former horns; and the little horn had "eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things."¹ Ver. 20 adds that its appearance or "look was more stout than its fellows."

The following explanation is given (vv. 23-25): "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth,

¹ The A.V. incorrectly translates in ver. 8 "a mouth speaking great things," and in ver. 20 "a mouth that spake very great things." The original in both places is the same.

which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise : and another shall arise after them ; and he shall be diverse from the first [horns], and he shall put down three kings. And he shall speak words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and he shall think to change times and laws, and they [the saints] shall be given into his hand until a time, times, and half a time."¹

The passages which speak of the judgment on the beast may be here passed over. But to complete the description of the little horn ver. 11 must be noted :—"I beheld at that time because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake : I beheld even till the beast [the fourth beast dominated by the little horn] was slain, and his body destroyed, and he was given to be burned with fire."

In interpreting the Book of the Revelation it is often necessary to take notice of the words or phrases quoted in it from the Book of Daniel. It would, however, be wrong to follow the reverse order, and to contend that, because certain symbols used in the Book of Daniel are employed in the Apocalypse, the symbols in Daniel ought to be regarded as depicting the same events. In discussing the meaning of the Book of Daniel with those who do not admit its authority, such a line of argument must be avoided. It must, however, be steadily borne in mind that the writer of the Apocalypse considered the fourth beast to be the Roman empire in some form or other, and the fact should not be ignored by a Christian commentator.

Attention may, however, fairly be drawn to the fact

¹ See *Critical Commentary*.

that the body of the beast depicted in Apoc. xiii., which plainly represents nothing else than the fourth beast of Daniel, was of a composite character. Its body was like a leopard, its feet like a bear, its mouths [for the beast in the Apocalypse had seven heads, and consequently seven mouths] were like the mouth of a lion. It was thus a compound of the first three beasts of Daniel. Daniel does not describe the body of the fourth beast, further than to say that its teeth were of iron, and its claws of brass. The other details of the beast may be filled up from the Apocalypse, so long as no distinct argument is founded on those details.

The four heads which the third beast possessed as it rose out of the sea were indicative of a characteristic belonging to that kingdom during the larger portion of its existence. Similarly, whatever the ten horns signify, they must be likewise characteristic of the fourth kingdom during the greater period of its existence.

In Nebuchadnezzar's dream two distinct phases of the fourth kingdom are described. In the first, the empire was strong and undivided. In the second, it was divided, "partly strong and partly brittle." In Daniel's exposition given in ch. ii., mention is made of efforts being continually put forth to restore its unity and strength. "They shall mingle themselves with the seed of men, but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron doth not mingle with clay" (ch. ii. 43). The toes of the image, composed partly of iron and partly of clay, appear to symbolise the weaker phase of the fourth empire, which phase set in when its unity was shattered and the empire was split up into a number of kingdoms. All the efforts made by the intermarriages of peoples and kings, with a view of reuniting the divided kingdoms, were destined to be fruitless.

No distinct mention is made in ch. vii. of those two phases of the fourth kingdom. With the help, however, of the vision of ch. ii., one may perhaps detect the idea underlying the second symbol. The beast was first represented as fearful, terror-inspiring, and excessively strong. But when "the little horn" bore sway, the power of the beast was divided among the ten horns, three of them having, however, been uprooted by "the little horn." Under such divided rule the beast could not possess the same power which it had when it rose first from the sea. However blasphemous the words of "the little horn," and however that horn might make war with the saints and overcome them, the strength which the beast had in its second phase was inferior to what it possessed at the commencement of its history. Its malignity and impiety were more developed, but the power that belonged to it was no longer the same.

The number "ten" is not expressly mentioned in the description of the image of ch. ii. The toes of the image are indeed spoken of, and attention is drawn to their composition, partly of iron and partly of clay. But no reference whatever is made to their *number*.

This fact has been often ignored. It, however, indicates that the number ten had no particular symbolical significance, any more than the ten fingers belonging to the hands of the image. When, however, the splitting up of the fourth beast into a number of relatively smaller kingdoms had to be represented by a number of horns on the head of an animal, a particular number had to be specified, and as the great image had ten toes, the number ten may for that reason have been selected as the number of the horns. "Ten" is regarded as the symbol of plurality or multiplicity. Ten was a considerable number

of horns to spring from the head of an animal, however large the animal represented might be.¹

The same remarks apply to the number of the horns uprooted. In the latter case, the number three simply denotes plurality, and a plurality proportionate to the total number of the horns. The three ribs of the carcass represented as being gnawed between the teeth of the bear may be regarded to some extent as a parallel. If "the little horn" had to be represented as uprooting *some*, but not all (not even the majority), of the horns which grew on the same head, no more suitable number than *three* could be imagined.

By "the little horn" a power or kingdom of a peculiar character was indicated. Small though it was, it had a look "more stout than its fellows" (ver. 20). It had "eyes like the eyes of a man," and "a mouth speaking great things" (ver. 8), or "great words" (ver. 11), and "words against the Most High" (ver. 25). Compare the description in Psalm xii. 3, 4, of the wicked men whom Jehovah will cut off, "the tongue that speaketh great things : who have said, With our tongue will we prevail ; our lips are our own : who is lord over us ?"

Thus far the fourth beast has been considered apart from any particular interpretation. Dean Farrar presents in a popular shape the solution of the symbol current among modern critics. Farrar agrees in the abstract with what has been already stated, that under the symbol two phases of the empire are delineated, but he explains those phases to be : (1) the conquests of Alexander, "which blazed

¹ Ten is often used in Scripture as a round number to signify merely *plurality*, and not a precise number. See Eccl. vii. 19 ; Amos v. 3, vi. 9 ; Zech. viii. 23 ; Matt. xxv. 1 ; Luke xix. 13, 17 ; Rev. ii. 10. See *Crit. Comm.*, ch. i. 12.

over the East with such irresistible force and suddenness," and (2) the kingdom of the Seleucidian monarchs.

That interpretation is, however, opposed to the description given of the Greek kingdom in ch. viii. The picture there presented is (1) of a united empire, signified by "a notable horn" on the head of the he-goat; (2) of a divided kingdom, split into four parts, those parts being depicted by four notable horns which arose after the great horn had been broken. (3) Moreover, ch. viii. describes a further stage of that divided empire. For there sprang up, without any dislocation or uprooting of the other four horns, but "out of one" of the four, "a very little horn," which represented, not the individual Antiochus Epiphanes, but the Greek power wielded by the three successive kings of Syria who attempted to destroy the Jewish nation, to wit, Antiochus Epiphanes, Antiochus Eupator, and Demetrius I., whose armies were one after another put to flight by the Maccabean chieftains.¹

In the symbolism of ch. viii., as well as in what may be termed the historical Targum which is combined with Daniel's prophecy in ch. xi., all is clear, and the Seleucidian kingdom is mentioned in its proper place. In the modern exposition of ch. vii. all is a mass of confusion. The ten horns of the fourth beast, which ought to be explained to represent a permanent phase of the fourth kingdom, are, contrary to all analogy, explained as ten successive monarchs of Syria.

It is noteworthy that, the more uncertain the exposition,

¹ The expressions "little horn" in ch. vii. and "very little horn" in ch. viii. are distinct from one another, though the fact is usually forgotten. See the *Crit. and Gramm. Comm.* Antiochus Epiphanes is not spoken of as an individual, but in connection with his two successors, as being an essential part of the Greek power; see *Bampton Lectures on Zechariah*, pp. 312-318.

the more confident becomes the language used concerning it by Dean Farrar and other critics. Farrar affirms that "it is almost certain that those ten kings are" the Syrian monarchs combined with certain aspirants to the throne who appeared in the period in question. According to this modern exposition, the prophecy was written after the events spoken of had taken place, and the number ten is regarded as being a precise number. The three uprooted horns are explained to be: (1) *Demetrius*, who was a hostage in Rome when his younger brother Antiochus ascended the throne of Syria, and who did not himself obtain the crown until after the death of Antiochus Eupator, who succeeded his father Antiochus Epiphanes; (2) *Heliodorus*, the chief minister of Seleucus IV., king of Syria, who murdered that monarch. After the murder Heliodorus attempted, but unsuccessfully, to seize the throne. He was expelled by Eumenes and Attalus of Pergamos, who took the side of Antiochus Epiphanes. (3) *Ptolemy VII., Philometor, king of Egypt*, is reckoned the third. He was nephew by marriage of Seleucus IV., declared war against Antiochus when the latter ascended the throne of Syria, and was beaten in the decisive battle of Pelusium.

Somewhat different is the interpretation given by Porphyry. According to that philosopher, the three horns uprooted symbolised the two Egyptian kings and brothers who carried on war with Antiochus, namely, Ptolemy Philometor and Ptolemy Euergetes II.; the third being Artaxias, king of Armenia.

Not one, however, of those three persons was really a sovereign of Syria. They cannot, therefore, be regarded as forming part of the ten horns, even if it could be proved that those ten horns represented ten successive

kings of Syria. It is also strange to imagine that ten successive kings of Syria (a kingdom which embraced only one fourth part of the Greek empire) could be represented as horns of a beast symbolising the entire fourfold Macedonian empire. It is further absurd to conceive that three individuals who never sat on the Syrian throne could be represented as "horns" of that beast, uprooted in order to prepare the way for the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes.

The interpretation is opposed alike to the facts of history and to the symbols made use of in the book. Bleek saw clearly enough the incongruity of explaining the ten horns to be ten successive monarchs of Syria.¹ He attempted, therefore, to expound the symbol of the numerous satrapies into which the Macedonian empire was subdivided on the occasion of the first distribution of its provinces among the generals of Alexander. The historian Justin gives the number of those satrapies as twenty-eight. They were distributed at the time among as many generals. That division was, however, soon modified, and the Greek empire by degrees was ultimately divided into four kingdoms. A division which lasted only a few years, and during that time was in a continual state of flux by reason of the wars between the various generals, has no right whatever to be regarded as a characteristic feature of the fourth beast. For these reasons, therefore, the fourth beast cannot represent the Macedonian empire.²

¹ In his article on "Die Messian. Weissagungen im B. Daniel" in the *Jahrbuch für deutsche Theologie*, v. pp. 60, 61.

² The arguments adduced by Mede (*Works*, pp. 711-716), in his *Three Treatises upon some Obscure Passages in Daniel*, to prove the Romans to be the fourth empire of Daniel are, in our opinion,

The description of "the little horn" of the fourth beast (ch. vii.) does not agree with that of "the very little horn" in ch. viii. The little horn of ch. vii. in its rise uprooted three of the ten horns on the head of the fourth beast. The very little horn of ch. viii. sprang out of one of the four horns on the head of the he-goat. It was an integral part of the horn on which it appeared. No uprooting of other horns is spoken of in ch. viii. In that chapter a sketch is given of the impieties committed by Antiochus Epiphanes and his two immediate successors in their attempt to suppress the Jewish religion. The description given in that chapter is, however, not such as could have been written at the Maccabean period of Jewish history. The allusions to the Jewish people and to their faith and ritual are clear in ch. viii. Those allusions are entirely absent in ch. vii. The little horn of ch. vii. spoke, indeed, great words against the Most High, sought to change times and law, made war on the saints and overcame them. But all is vague and general. No reference whatever is made to the pollution of the Temple, or to the abolition of the daily sacrifice. Nothing is mentioned specially characteristic of the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. In the mention made of an attempt to "change the times," *i.e.* the seasons of holy festival, reference is made to the earlier history of Israel, in the days of the Great Schism. Antiochus Epiphanes did not attempt to change the Jewish seasons. He sought to abolish the Jewish religion altogether. Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, the author of the great Israelitish Schism, "changed the

perfectly conclusive. But it is useless here to give a summary of those arguments, because in the present state of the controversy they would not be recognised as conclusive by the modern school.

times and the law" when he altered the month of the Passover festival, and when he altered the ritual and priesthood of Israel. In the attempt to change law, allusion is made to the Divine covenant which had been made with Israel.

The ancient interpretation, which explains the fourth beast to mean the Roman empire, is the only interpretation which fulfils the requirements of the prophecy. In order to demolish the arguments which Christian apologists founded on the prophecies of Daniel, and on this prophecy in particular, Porphyry sought to demonstrate that the Book of Daniel was a production of the Maccabean era. The arguments of Porphyry were, in process of time, embraced by the Rationalistic school of criticism, and have been commended by all the devices of brilliant scholarship and imagination. Some orthodox scholars, indeed, have considered themselves compelled to accept the conclusions of those modern critics. Those commentators, however, fell into grievous error. The Book of Daniel, whatever difficulties may beset some of its historical statements, contains prophecies which, fairly examined, show a supernatural knowledge of events which, in the Maccabean era, were still in the womb of futurity.

The explanation of the fourth world-power as the Roman will be found, on careful examination, to fulfil all the points mentioned in the vision of the great image, or in that of the four beasts. The details of those visions do not harmonise with any other interpretation. The strength and power of the Roman empire, which exceeded all the kingdoms which went before it, and the breaking up of that empire into a multiplicity of kingdoms—which no later conquests or matrimonial alliances could ever reunite again into one,—all those facts

are set forth in the pictures of Daniel. When a sketch of the wars between the Syrian and Egyptian kingdoms is given in the later part of the book, only two intermarriages are mentioned (ch. xi. 6, 17), and neither one nor other of those marriages was entered into with any object of reuniting the broken fragments of the Greek empire.¹ The history of Europe, however, since the disruption of the Roman empire, teems with illustrations of the fact predicted in ch. ii. 43. We are fully entitled to argue that those matrimonial connections were not confined to the kings, but included also the subjects of the various kingdoms.²

The interpretation of these portions of the Book of Daniel has been sadly mixed up with fantastic imaginations concerning Antichrist. St John, the only New Testament writer who employs that term, makes no

¹ Pusey well observes (*Daniel*, pp. 141-2): "The marriage of Antiochus Theos with Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus, was not, like those in Teutonic empires, to cement two nations against others whose strength was dreaded. It was simply a way of ending a war of which Ptolemy was weary. It was the policy of Antiochus the Great alone to unite Egypt with him against Rome. One intermarriage is not characteristic of the policy of an empire. Again, it is said that the attempt to cement their strength by intermarriages is a characteristic of Alexander's successors. These intermarriages belong to the decay of the fourth empire in Daniel, when the iron strength, symbolised in the iron legs of the image, was gone, and there had succeeded to it the mixed strength and weakness in the toes, the iron intermingled with the miry clay. But of those two marriages, the one took place in the first generation of the Seleucidæ; the other in that of Antiochus the Great, who broke the strength of the Syrian kingdom against the Romans. When then was the time of strength, if this was its decay?"

² See, in refutation of the statement that the Roman empire has been long extinct, the supplementary note at the end of ch. vii. in the *Crit. and Gramm. Comm.*

distinction whatever between "an Antichrist" and "the Antichrist." That distinction was in the main an invention of the learned Jesuit interpreters of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. St John, no doubt, refers to the prophecies of the Old Testament in which intimations were given that even the times of the Messiah would be a period in which light and darkness would still be strangely commingled.¹ St Paul speaks more distinctly than St John of "the falling away" from the faith in the midst of the professing Church of Christ. St John did not scruple to call the early Gnostic heretics by the name of "the Antichrist." So far was the apostle from pointing to an individual Antichrist to arise in the future, that he emphatically declared: "Many deceivers are gone forth into the world, they that confess not that Jesus cometh in the flesh. This is *the* deceiver and *the* antichrist" (2 John 7). Apostolic language, therefore, justifies the application of that designation to all the false teachers in the Church of God, from the days of St John up to the time of the Second Advent of the Son of man.

Every prophecy ought, as far as possible, to be interpreted independently of any other subsequent prophecy. It is necessary, however, here to allude to the New Testament prophecies, because we reject the idea that "the little horn" is "an anti-Christian power destined to arise in the future." The prophecy of ch. vii., no doubt, extends to the day of the consummation of all things. All that Daniel was permitted to know was that, in the second portion of the duration of the last world-empire, a power of a peculiar character would arise, which would overturn some of the kingdoms in the midst of which it

¹ See *Bampton Lectures on Zechariah*, pp. 485 ff.

would spring up. That power would not uproot all those kingdoms ; but, though "little" in itself, it would exercise a powerful influence over the others, and be recognised in some aspects as their mouthpiece. It would claim authority, like Jeroboam of old, to change religious festivals as policy might find convenient, and claim a supreme authority in matters of law and religion. Daniel's vision describes the "great words" of "the little horn" as "words" spoken "against the Most High." It predicts that the acts of "the little horn" would be opposed by God's saints, but that it would wage war against them and overcome them, and seek by relentless persecutions to "wear out the saints of the Most High."¹

¹ It is strange to find even scholars unwilling to face the fact that no such persecuting system as that of the Church of Rome can be pointed out in history. Pagan persecutions were bad, but the number of sufferers by those terrible outbreaks of heathen fury was far below the number of those who suffered at the hands of the Church of Rome throughout the long centuries during which she ruled the Western world. Nor is that all. The Church of Rome still affirms and declares that she possesses "by Divine right" authority over kings and nations. She can absolve subjects from all allegiance sworn to their sovereigns. And she claims the right to confiscate the property of those whom she chooses to designate as "heretics," and to imprison their persons, and to condemn them to the flames. She asserts that civil rulers are bound to kill heretics when ordered to do so by the Church. It is not necessary to recall to mind the persecutions of the Middle Ages, for she claims to-day the same powers which she then put into practice. Every one of these powers is claimed in the *Institutes of Public Ecclesiastical Law*, printed at the Papal press at Rome in 1901, and published by the Papal publisher, duly authorised by the highest ecclesiastical authorities at Rome, and having the warm commendation of Pope Leo XIII. printed on the green covers of each of the two volumes. "The coercive jurisdiction of the Church of Christ" is laid down in the most categorical terms in vol. i. pp. 139-152. The full title of the work we allude to is *Institutiones Iuris Ecclesiastici Publici* quas juxta

So far Daniel was permitted to know the future. His vision does not go further. It is scarcely necessary to designate by name the special power referred to, or speak of its rise, history, or fall. In all ages of the Church, from the days of Gregory the Great down to the present, men have pointed to the Papacy as the fulfilment of the prophecy. That interpretation is set forth in the Homilies of the Church of England and by all the Reformed Churches. The interpretation, however, has been ignored or rejected by critics, for reasons which need not be specified. It can, however, stand all the tests of criticism.

The grand assize spoken of in vv. 9-14, in ver. 22, and in vv. 26, 27 need only be glanced at. The judgment is described as commencing shortly after the rise of the fourth kingdom. The opposition to Messiah's kingdom on the part of the fourth empire called for judgment almost at the very commencement of its history. And, according to the prophecy, the "words" of "the little horn" will in due season bring down the Divine vengeance upon the world.

The midnight session of the Jewish Sanhedrin, before which our Lord was arraigned for impiety, was, in the eyes of man, a matter of little importance. The mock trial that took place the next day before Pontius Pilate, the representative in Judæa of the Roman empire, was also a trifling affair in the eyes of the world. The result of those two mock trials was that our Lord was

methodam Card. Tarquini tradebat in schola institutionum canonicarum P. Marianus de Luca S.J. nunc. Textus Decretalium Professor in Universitate Gregoriana. Libraria Pontificia: Frid. Pustet—Romæ, Ratisboniæ, Neo-Eboraci, 1901. The first volume of the work consists of 342 closely printed pages; the second has 460 pages. See Appendix No. III. in the *Crit. and Gramm. Comm.*

condemned to death by the one for blasphemy against God, and by the other for treason against the emperor. Crucified as a malefactor, yet strangely buried in a rich man's grave,¹ Jesus was declared to be the Son of God by the resurrection from the dead (Rom. i. 1). His advent in humiliation is not specially depicted by the Old Testament prophet. Daniel depicts what afterwards took place in the heavenly regions. Thrones were placed for judgment, and the Ancient of days took His seat. No sooner did He take that place than one "like to a son of man," *i.e.* one in human form, came towards Him with the clouds of heaven, and was brought near to Him. The picture resembles that drawn in the 2nd Psalm, and expounded in Acts iv. 24-28. It may be suitably set forth in the language of Psalm cx. : "Jehovah said to my Lord"—to the Son of man and Son of God, when He ascended up on high after His earthly conflict—"Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool" (Ps. cx. 1). Judgment is then represented as passed upon the three first beasts; for the Ascension of Christ, in one sense, was the "day of judgment for the nations." "Weltgeschichte ist Weltgericht" (*Schiller*). Their dominion was taken away, but "their lives were prolonged for a time." That judgment is described as still proceeding. It will continue to sit until the "great words" spoken by the little horn against the Most High come finally into remembrance before God, and the beast ruled over by that God-defying power, the apostate Church, is slain with the sword that proceedeth out of the mouth (Rev. xix. 15) of Him to whom all judgment has

¹ See our essay on *The Suffering Servant of Jehovah depicted in Isaiah lii. and liii., considered in relation to Past and Present Criticism*. London : Francis Griffiths, 1905.

been committed, "because he is the Son of man" (John v. 22, 27). Then will come the day of judgment for individuals. Then the saints overcome and trodden down in the mire will be elevated to the throne, according to the prophecy of Daniel, and the promise given by Christ Himself after His resurrection: "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne" (Rev. iii. 21).¹

¹ Dr Pusey's observations on the fulfilment of this prophecy concerning Christ and His kingdom are well worthy of notice. The prophet does not depict a *kingdom*, but an individual *king*, whom all nations, peoples, and languages were to worship. The dominion of this Great King is predicted as not to pass away. The prophecy has from the time of the Book of Enoch been regarded as Messianic. It is thus explained in the Targums and the Talmuds. It is turning aside from the light to regard it as a mere day-dream of a Maccabean writer. It is a genuine, divinely-inspired prophecy, and it has to a large extent been already accomplished.

CHAPTER VI

THE PROPHECY ABOUT MEDO-PERSIA AND GREECE

THE date assigned for the vision recorded in the eighth chapter is "the third year of the reign of Belshazzar," or shortly before the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. The vision of the four great beasts or world-empires was seen in "the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon."¹ The subject of the vision of ch. viii. is the history of the Medo-Persian and Grecian empires.

Josephus, and many modern critics, maintain that Daniel is represented as having been at the time at Susa. It is, however, more probable that he was there only "in vision." Jeremiah was in prophetic vision twice transported to the Euphrates (Jer. xiii. 4-7), a stream which he probably never beheld; and Ezekiel, while among the captives by the river Chebar, "in the land of the Chaldeans," was, in the visions of God, transported to Jerusalem, and traversed the courts of the holy Temple² (Ezek. viii. 3 ff., xi. ff.).

¹ The difficulties connected with these dates are discussed in Chap. IV. § 1 and the *Critical Commentary*.

² Our Lord, who, until His temptation was concluded (Mark i. 13; Luke iv. 2), abode in the wilderness, seems to have been in vision transported to the pinnacle of the Temple, and to "an exceeding high mountain." St Paul similarly found himself caught away in vision to the third heaven, or Paradise; while St John was carried aloft to higher regions.

Susa is mentioned in Assyrian inscriptions of the times of Sennacherib and Assurbanipal. Herodotus speaks of the river Choaspes flowing by Susa (i. 188), of the city being built on the banks of that river (v. 49, 52), and of the water of the Choaspes being used as drinking-water by the Persian kings. Herodotus does not mention the Eulæus. The Choaspes and Eulæus have, therefore, by older critics been supposed to be different names for the same stream. Professor Friedrich Delitzsch has, however, shown from Assyrian inscriptions that the Choaspes and Eulæus are two distinct rivers (*Wo lag das Paradies?* p. 329). The city Susa probably occupied, more or less, the land between the two streams. The *fortress* (Heb. *birah*, Assyr. *birtu*), inaccurately rendered *palace* in the A.V. and R.V., was on the Ulai, or Eulæus. There the Persian monarchs resided, and in it large treasures were kept. The *fortress* is mentioned as a royal residence in the Book of Esther, and in Neh. i. 1. The Choaspes (or the Kercha) and the Eulæus (or the Karun) discharged their waters in early times into a bay of the Persian Gulf, known in Assyrian inscriptions as the Nar Marratum. These rivers now flow into the Shat-el-Arab, the ancient bay having been silted up.

Cyrus made Susa his capital. The French excavators have proved it to be a city of great antiquity. In the time of Daniel, Susa was the chief city of the province of Elam, and lay outside the Babylonian empire. In later days it was the capital of the province of Susiana. The city was well known in Maccabean days. The mention in ver. 2 of "the province of Elam" is a mark of antiquity.

Standing in front of Susa, on the banks of the Ulai, as Daniel looked up he saw a ram standing before the river. The ram had two horns, which is indicated by the

Hebrew dual.¹ Both horns were high, but one of them was higher than the other. The loftier one was seen by the prophet as shooting up after the other.

The ram was a fit emblem of the Medo-Persian empire. In Ezekiel (xxxiv. 17, xxxix. 18), leaders and princes are pictured as "rams and he-goats" (comp. Zech. x. 3). The kings of the nations in Sheol or Hades are termed by Isaiah "the he-goats of the earth" (Isa. xiv. 9).

The two horns represent the kings, or rather the kingdoms, of Media and Persia.² Individual kings are not here thought of. Media and Persia, after the conquest of the former kingdom by Cyrus, were united into one empire. The inferiority of Persia in point of antiquity of rule, and its superiority in power, are indicated in the symbol of the higher horn springing up last.³

Daniel saw the ram striking (*butting*) westward (lit. seaward), and northward, and southward. The LXX., for symmetry's sake, insert "eastward" before "westward." The translators forgot that the ram described had its back towards the east, and what took place in that direction was out of its sight. All the animals struck by the ram were worsted in the encounter. No wild beasts or kingdoms were able to stand before it. (Comp. 2 Kings x. 4.)

The conquests of the Medo-Persian empire are here described. The Medo-Persian empire overran the whole

¹ On these points see *Critical Commentary*.

² Jerome, however, interprets the two *kings* to be Darius, the uncle of Cyrus, who reigned over the Medians after his father Astyages, and Cyrus. See Rosenmüller.

³ That fact, however, is not pointed out in the earlier vision of ch. vii. by the bear lifting itself up on one side. See p. 152. The bear in ch. vii. is so depicted because a bear assumes that attitude in the moment of attack.

territories up to the Mediterranean. Asia Minor with the islands of Cyprus, Rhodes, Samos, Lesbos, and the Cyclades were reduced under its sway. In the north it overran Colchis, Armenia, and the countries up to the Caspian Sea; and in the south subdued Egypt, Libya, and Abyssinia. "There was none that could deliver out of its hand." In the east the conquests of the Persians extended to India; but the Persian conquests in that direction had no bearing upon the history of the Jewish people, and are not therefore described.

While the ram was thus displaying its strength, a he-goat "came from the west over the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground." It bounded along at such a pace that its feet did not seem to touch the surface of the earth, but to fly over it. The he-goat was a symbol of the Greek or Macedonian power.

The he-goat of the vision had one conspicuous horn, which was between its eyes. That notable or conspicuous horn is, in ver. 23, explained to be the first king. Jerome confounds the he-goat with the horn which dominated it; and the same mistake pervades his explanation of the ram, which he interprets to mean Darius the Mede, then Cyrus, and finally Darius Codomanus, who was defeated by Alexander.¹

The rapidity of Alexander's conquests is vividly portrayed by the progress of the he-goat. Rapidly crossing the Hellespont with 40,000 Greek troops, Alexander gained his first victory over the Persian armies at the Granicus, B.C. 334, and overran in that year and part of the next the whole of Asia Minor. He took by siege several important cities, while other cities opened

¹ The interpretation woven into the text of the Syriac Peshitto is (see p. 144) on the general lines as drawn by Jerome.

their gates at the mere summons of the conqueror. Alexander gained a decisive victory over Darius Codomanus, who commanded in person, at the battle of Issus in November of the next year (B.C. 333). He then invaded Phœnicia and captured Tyre, thus destroying the base from which a Persian fleet might have operated. Palestine submitted to his authority. He besieged Gaza, overran Egypt, and, turning northwards to Babylon, defeated Darius in the decisive battle of Arbela, in B.C. 331. Ere B.C. 330, Alexander had taken possession of Babylon and Susa, burned Persepolis, and put an end to the Persian empire. Thus did the he-goat with its one horn cast down the two-horned ram to the ground and trample upon it, while there was no one who could deliver the ram out of his hand.

The differences between the Hebrew and LXX. versions of the vision, which are on the whole unimportant, are noticed in the *Critical Commentary*. The more important portions of the prophecy, however, require here special attention. It may be well in passing to notice some points in the verses already summarised which conflict with the hypothesis that the prophecy was written subsequent to the events described.

Kranichfeld has observed that the symbol of the one-horned goat in this vision does not coincide with the representation of Alexander with the two horns of a ram, found on coins struck by that monarch after his visit to the temple of Jupiter Ammon. Such coins, directly or indirectly, led to the name of the *Two-horned*,¹ which is given to Alexander in the Koran, and by Arabic writers.

The two horns of the Medo-Persian ram are repre-

¹ Arab. ذُو الْقَرْنَيْنِ.

sented as broken at one and the same time by the fierce onset of the he-goat. A writer of a later period would scarcely have given that description. No allusion is made to the great battles of the Granicus, Issus, and Arbela ; but the struggle between the opposing empires is described as taking place at the river Ulai, in front of Susa. No doubt Susa in later days was the centre of the Persian power. A writer of the Maccabean era would rather have spoken of the struggle as taking place near Babylon. The coincidence between the main facts of history and the outlines drawn in the vision is remarkable. The outlines have been delineated in the manner characteristic of other Biblical prophecies, which seldom enter into details.

No sooner had the one-horned he-goat thus shown its superiority by trampling the ram under its feet, than the great horn on its own head was suddenly broken off. How the event occurred is not narrated, but in place of the one horn four smaller horns soon shot out toward the four winds of heaven.

The four horns have been almost unanimously interpreted to denote the four kingdoms into which the Macedonian empire, after the overthrow of Antigonus, was ultimately divided. In the interval between the death of Alexander in 323 and the battle of Ipsus in 301, in which Antigonus was slain and his army routed, many different divisions of the Macedonian empire took place, most of them of an ephemeral character.

After the battle of Ipsus the Macedonian empire was finally divided into four. Those four kingdoms were, speaking generally, in the direction of all the winds of heaven. The expression must not, however, be pressed as if it marked out the precise geographical location.

Lysimachus was at first assigned the greater portion of Asia Minor towards the north; the eastern part of the empire fell to Seleucus; Cassander retained Macedonia in the west; and Ptolemy obtained Egypt and the south. Those particular divisions were afterwards modified, but the quadruple character of the empire remained more or less visible until the subjugation of the Greek empire by the Romans. The quadruple character of the Greek empire is indicated in the vision of the seventh chapter by the four heads and four wings which were characteristics of the leopard, or the third wild beast.

Behrmann stands alone in maintaining that the number four ought not to be explained historically, but that the final clause of ver. 8 should rather be translated "according to the four winds of heaven." In disproof of the historical explanation, Behrmann appeals to the variations of opinion among commentators as to what were the four particular kingdoms, and asks, "Who among the original readers of our book had any knowledge of such points, and if he had, of what advantage was it?" Such objections are, however, but weak arguments in disproof of an interpretation current from the earliest times.

Notwithstanding the criticisms of Behrmann, it seems clear that the Macedonian empire is represented in this vision as divided into two distinct periods. The first period was that in which the empire was under the sway of a single ruler; the second, the period of its division into four separate kingdoms. The unity of the Greek empire continued for some years after the death of Alexander. Although wars occurred between the various generals in command of its provinces, the empire remained to some extent one, until the murder by Cassander in 311 of Roxana and her son Alexander, then sixteen

years of age, who was the legitimate heir of Alexander the Great. His accession to the throne of the undivided empire had up to that date been everywhere expected. After his murder the Macedonian empire was permanently broken up into four independent kingdoms.

The indefiniteness in matters of detail on the one hand, and the clearness of outline with which the chief points of the history are delineated on the other, stamp this chapter of the Book of Daniel with the characteristic features of inspired prophecy.

Out of one of the four horns which the prophet had seen rise from the head of the he-goat, there soon sprang forth "a very small horn" (see *Crit. Comm.*). It came from the lower part of the horn with which it was connected. The "very little horn" (ver. 9), as afterwards explained, was a development of one of the four horns already in existence. It was not a fifth horn. It waxed exceeding great towards the south, and toward the east, and toward the glorious land. Small though it was, it seemed in the vision to shoot up as high as the stars, and to strike against some of the host of heaven. Through its instrumentality, the he-goat cast down some of those stars to the earth, and insolently trampled them under foot. Not content, too, with such an exploit, it dared even to rush against the bosses of the Almighty's buckler (Job xv. 26). It magnified itself against the Prince of the host of heaven, the Prince of princes. It had trodden down His people, it sought further to abolish His worship. All that Jehovah had specially enjoined as "*the perpetual service*"¹ was expressly forbidden. Under that appellation the following acts connected with the Temple worship are included: (1) the offering up of the incense (Exod.

¹ Hebrew הַקָּמִיד.

xxx. 8); (2) the presentation of the shewbread (Exod. xxv. 30; Lev. xxiv. 9; Num. iv. 7); (3) the lighting of the candlestick (Exod. xxvii. 20; Lev. xxiv. 2); (4) the fire on the altar (Lev. vi. 5, 6, 12, 13, E.V.); together with (5) the daily sacrifice of the morning and evening lamb (Exod. xxix. 42; Num. xxviii. 3, 6, 23, 24, etc.). The expression "*the perpetual service*" is not in the Old Testament an equivalent for the *daily sacrifice*, although used in that sense in the Talmuds and later Hebrew.¹

The horn by whose instrumentality such strange things were performed is described as one which (to translate literally) had come forth "from smallness" (ver. 2). The expression is strange, but all the emendations proposed are purely conjectural.

A number of alterations in the text have been suggested by critics, with the avowed object of bringing the description of the "very small horn" of ch. viii. into line with that of "the little horn" of ch. vii. 8 (see *Crit. Comm.*), which is, however, radically distinct from that of ch. viii. in the circumstances of its rise, history, and end. The very names given to each are distinct. Modern critics have exhibited in every detail a determination not to expound the text in the original or in the ancient translations, but to rewrite the book in order to destroy its prophetic character.

The animosity on the part of "the very small horn" against Jehovah is represented in the vision as manifested by acts performed on the earth. The place of the sanctuary which was cast down (ver. 11) was not the sanctuary in heaven, but the earthly Temple at Jerusalem.

¹ The same expression occurs in the Cylinder Inscription of Cyrus, line 7.

The word "*host*," or "*army*," ought to be taken throughout in a uniform sense. It denotes the stars or heavenly host. It is fanciful, with Ebrard, to interpret those stars of *evil angels*, or of an *army* of the Jews, or an *army* of Greeks (*Ewald*), or a *campaign* (*Hitzig*). Modern critics are fond of novelties ; hence Professor G. F. Moore has sought to explain the phrase to mean the gods of the heathen nations ; while Bevan and Behrmann expound it in one place of *God's people*, and in another of the *temple service* !

The prophet beheld the "very small horn" of the he-goat strike some of the stars, which consequently fell from heaven on the earth (ver. 10). Those fallen stars represented the "mighty ones" of Israel who were seduced by Greek artifice from their integrity, and the holy people (ver. 24) who became profane by transgression. There is, perhaps, a play upon words in the expression used in the Hebrew (ver. 9), "*the glory*," or "*the glorious land*," and "*the host*," or holy people dwelling in that land, who were to be as numerous as the stars of heaven. Hence Israel was pictorially described by "the stars." Israel's God is "the Prince of the host," who, as the angel Gabriel pointed out, was "Prince of princes," because He ruled not only Israel, but all the princes of the earth.

There is no difficulty in understanding the general sense of ver. 12, although many critics regard it as difficult. The Hebrew prophets always ascribed Israel's misfortunes to Israel's sins. This is the teaching of Moses (Deut. xxxii.), and of all the prophets that follow after. The sanctuary and the "*perpetual service*" performed in the Temple of Jerusalem were the visible signs of the presence of Jehovah among His people. The abandonment of that sanctuary, and the cessation of "the

perpetual service," were visible and unmistakable proofs that Jehovah had departed from His people. The giving over of "an host" of Israel (ver. 12), or "the host" of Israel (ver. 10), into the hand of the enemy could only happen on account of Israel's transgression (ver. 12). It was an outward and visible sign that the transgressors had come to the full (ver. 23). Transgression in the midst of Israel was that "which maketh desolate." Sin separates between God and His people (Isa. lix. 2).

Hence apostasy within Israel brought down a scourge upon Israel. The writer of the first Book of Maccabees records the rise of transgressors of the Law within Israel, and the fatal influence those sinners exercised on many Jews in the commencement of Antiochus Epiphanes' reign (1 Macc. i. 11-15). That "mystery of iniquity" had worked for a long time in secret ere it became openly manifested. The accession of Antiochus Epiphanes was not the cause, but merely the occasion of the outbreak. It was that manifestation of iniquity which caused Jehovah's indignation against His people, and God's indignation was the rod and battle-axe in the adversaries' hands which enabled them to trample upon Israel (Isa. x. 5).

Before we consider the description of the king who executed the Divine vengeance, it is necessary to notice briefly the translation of ver. 11 given by the LXX. The Hebrew, as translated in the R.V., is: "Yea, it (the very little horn) magnified itself, even to the prince of the host; and it took away from him the continual *burnt offering* [the two last words are printed in italics because they are not in the original text], and the place of his sanctuary was cast down." It is difficult to recognise the verse under the LXX. translation: "Until the chief-captain shall deliver the captivity; and by him the

everlasting mountains were broken, and their place and sacrifice was taken away, and he placed her [the city or sanctuary] even on the ground upon the earth, and they prospered, and it was (so), and the holy place shall be desolated."¹

The avengers who executed Jehovah's wrath upon the apostate Church and people were the Greek monarchs of Syria, Antiochus Epiphanes together with his two successors. Those executors of judgment are personified in this vision as "a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences," who was to arise "in the latter time of their kingdom," *i.e.* towards the close of the Grecian rule, after the Macedonian empire.²

The king is described indefinitely as one "*of fierce countenance,*"³ like the enemy prophesied of by Moses in Deut. xxviii. 50, whose cruelties towards apostate Israel are detailed in that terrible passage. That enemy is further described as *skilled in craft* and *pretences* (ver. 24), one who would prosper by deceit, and, without innate strength or power, would wonderfully prevail for a time in opposing the truth, destroying the holy people, and standing up against the Prince of princes, although at last he would be broken without hand (ver. 25).

The description is vague and indefinite. It gives no distinct picture of the rise, progress, or fall of Antiochus Epiphanes. It is a description which might almost equally well suit any other heathen persecutor. The outlines are not to be filled up by incidents taken at fancy from the

¹ See *Critical Commentary*.

² The Hebrew phrase is a note of *time*, not of *locality*. Hence the ingenious attempts made by G. S. Faber and others to interpret the vision of the rise and fall of Mohammedanism in the East *behind* the territorial limits of the Grecian empire must be rejected.

³ See on these and similar expressions the *Critical Commentary*.

descriptions of ch. vii. (which do not refer to the times of Antiochus), or by incidents drawn from the prophecy of ch. xi., which does speak of Maccabean days. Every prophecy, to use the homely phraseology of John Bunyan, must stand like a tub upon its own bottom. Dr Pusey goes too far when he ventures to assert: "In the eighth chapter, where Daniel did portray Antiochus, every trait corresponds; we are at a loss for nothing; not a word is without meaning." And further: "The end of Antiochus was briefly and strikingly characterised in the eighth chapter, a sudden, yet not violent death, amid a life of war and plunder" (Dr Pusey's *Daniel*, pp. 96 and 92).

The latter statement is peculiarly unfortunate. For the only parallel to the expression "*without hand*" (ver. 25) is the Aramaic phrase used of the stone cut out of the mountain "*without hands*" (Dan. ii. 34). No necessarily sudden event is depicted in ch. ii. 34. In both passages the phrases used denote events brought about by Divine and not by human agency. The eighth chapter of Daniel does not depict the sudden death of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Nor is any allusion made in the prophecy to the murder of Onias III., an event the importance of which modern critics have unduly magnified. The cessation of "the perpetual service" in the Temple is mentioned, and the treading down under foot both of that sanctuary and of Israel. Similar things, however, and even worse, took place when the Holy Temple and the people of Israel were trodden under foot by the Babylonians. No allusion is made in this vision of Daniel to the shameful profanation of the altar by the sacrifice of swine, nor to the erection of a heathen altar over that of Jehovah. No allusion also

is made to an idol set up above or beside that altar. No reference is made to the scandalous profanation of the sabbath, or to the abolition of circumcision. And yet one would naturally and reasonably expect reference to be made to all those events, had the prophecy been written in the Maccabean era. The outlines of the vision of Dan. viii. are vague and indefinite. It speaks of judgment commencing at the house and people of God. It speaks of the people being given into the hands of their enemies on account of their sins or transgressions. It points onward, but darkly, to a day of rescue, and to the cleansing of the sanctuary. The indefiniteness of the prophecy is strongly in favour of its genuineness. It proves the vision to be no *vaticinium post eventum*.

These strange phenomena have puzzled and perplexed the critics, simply because they are signs of genuineness. Professor Bevan's admissions are most important. That critic maintains that verses 11 and 12 "are among the most difficult in the book, as is shown by the great disagreement between the commentators."

In other words, modern commentators cannot discover in the vision the details they desiderate, and hence they assert, "That the text here is very corrupt can scarcely be doubted"; and again, "The passage (ver. 12) in its present form does not admit of a satisfactory rendering, and since no plausible emendation has, so far as I am aware, been suggested, we can conclude only, from what follows, that verses 11 and 12 contain some allusion to the cessation of the daily sacrifice, and to the pollution of the Temple with heathen rites. Beyond this, all is mere conjecture" (*Bevan*, p. 133).

Such is the conclusion arrived at by one of the ablest and, metaphorically speaking, most iconoclastic of modern

critics. Regarded from our standpoint, the conclusion arrived at by Professor Bevan is a distinct confession of failure. The vision of Dan. viii., although it sets forth the outlines of the attempt at the close of the Greek rule over Palestine to "mend and end" the worship of Jehovah, was not written in Maccabean times. In that case it must necessarily have contained far more distinct references to the terrible events of that history. To maintain that the text is corrupt in the very places in which the language of the prophecy ought, on the hypothesis of modern criticism, to have been clear and definite, is the last resort of expositors who propound explanations out of harmony with the text which they profess to interpret.

We pass over here the dialogue between the holy ones in verses 13, 14; see, however, *Crit. Comm.* But it is necessary briefly to touch upon the great difficulty of the chapter, namely, the time assigned for the duration of the events alluded to in ver. 14.

The question asked in ver. 13 is: "*How long shall be the vision regarding the perpetual service and regarding the transgression which maketh desolate, to give both the sanctuary and host to be trodden on?*"¹

The answer follows in ver. 14: "*Until evening morning, two thousand and three hundred, then shall the sanctuary (or a sanctuary) be cleansed.*" We have translated literally in order to preserve the peculiarities of diction. The expression "evening morning" is unique. The phrase in ver. 26, "the vision of the evening and the morning," does not necessarily cast any light upon its signification.

¹ See p. 190. The reader may consult our *Crit. Comm.* on each of these expressions. The question, as given both in the LXX. and Theodotion, is very different from that in the Hebrew.

The LXX. and Theodotion explain "evening morning" in its natural sense to mean *νυχθήμερον*, a day with its evening and morning, after the analogy of the six days mentioned in Gen. i. Another interpretation has, however, been put upon the phrase. It has been explained from the daily sacrifices offered in the morning and between the evenings (Exod. xxix. 39) to mean 2300 sacrifices, which, being offered morning and evening, were performed on 2300 half days = 1150 full days. That explanation of the phrase is, however, unnatural, and has only been invented to force the period referred to into line with the "time, times, and a half" of ch. vii.

All efforts, however, to harmonise the period, whether expounded as 2300 days or as 1150 days, with any precise historical epoch mentioned in the Books of the Maccabees or in Josephus have proved futile. Dr Pusey maintains that the Hebrew phrase can only mean 2300 days. He repudiates the idea that the duration is "a round number" (Pusey's *Daniel*, p. 221). Pusey and Hävernick consider the period commenced at the date assigned in 1 Macc. i. 54 as that of the desecration of the Temple. Calculated from the 15th of Kislev, A.S. 145 (or B.C. 168), on which the Temple was desecrated, to Adar 15th, A.S. 151 (or B.C. 161), the period, according to those scholars, is only a month short of the required 2300 days.

But while the *terminus a quo* suggested may fairly agree with that given in the vision, the same cannot be affirmed of the *terminus ad quem*. Three years after its profanation the Temple was cleansed from all idolatrous worship, and the Feast of the Dedication instituted, namely, on the 25th Kislev, B.C. 165. The battle of Adasa was fought on the 15th Adar, B.C. 161, *i.e.* 2271 days after the desecration of the Temple. In that battle Nicanor, the

general sent by Demetrius to restore the waning fortunes of the Hellenising party, was defeated and slain. According to the story told in 2 Macc. xv., Nicanor's right hand, which had been stretched out against Jerusalem, was nailed to the gate, afterwards known as the gate of Nicanor. That event took place long after the restoration of "the daily sacrifice" in the Temple. That was by no means the last battle fought in that eventful period. Professor Driver is justified in stating, "It seems impossible to find two events separated by 2300 days = 6 years and 4 months which would correspond with the description."

If, however, by means of the unnatural explanation of "evening morning" as a half day, the period be reduced to 1150 days, *i.e.* to 3 years and 2 months, the result may perhaps be somewhat better, considered purely as a point of history. It is possible, if it be granted that the author of the Book of Daniel and the writer of 1 Maccabees were contemporaries, that the one might with equal truth have regarded the trial of the Jewish nation as lasting only three years, and the other as continuing three years and two months.

This reduction of the period by one-half has not been proposed with the object of harmonising the vision with the events narrated by the historian of 1 Maccabees. It has been proposed with the object of treating as identical periods distinctly marked off from one another in the Book of Daniel. The "time, times, and a half" of Daniel vii. has nothing whatever to do with the period mentioned in Daniel viii.

Two points may be briefly noticed:—(1) That it is a matter of uncertainty whether Theodotion read the numeral 2300 or 2400 days. Jerome affirms that some

in his day read the numeral 2200. Whether, however, the reduction to 2200 was a harmonising device of early expositors, or actually found in ancient versions, we know not. Mediæval commentators have even read the numeral 1200 days. But there is no such various reading as the latter now known.

(2) Daniel's vision is not confined to the times of Antiochus Epiphanes. The great single horn of the he-goat represented not so much Alexander the Great as an individual; it portrayed the Macedonian power up to the period at which it was definitely divided into four independent kingdoms. Similarly, the "very little horn" did not represent the individual Antiochus Epiphanes, but the Greek kingdom of Syria from the date of that monarch's accession. The kingdom of Syria had been reduced in extent in consequence of the reverses of Antiochus the Great. The object of the successors of Antiochus the Great was to strengthen the kingdom internally, in order to pave the way for the recovery of its lost provinces. To bring about a greater unity of the kingdom, Antiochus Epiphanes, with the monarchs who succeeded him, strove to secure uniformity of religion. Supported by the Hellenising party among the Jews, those Syrian monarchs first sought to corrupt, and then to persecute, the Jews who remained faithful to the worship of Jehovah. The profanation of the Temple was deliberately undertaken in order to extirpate the religion of Jehovah. The attempts on the part of Antiochus to trample on "the holy people" were actively continued under his successors, Antiochus Eupator and Demetrius I. The death of Antiochus Epiphanes was merely a momentary lull in that tempest, "when the blast of the terrible ones was as a storm against the wall" (Isa. xxv. 4).

Hebrew prophets from the earliest times in their predictions of great temporal deliverances have been wont to allude to "the days of Messiah." Those days were in view even when the assembling of the tribes of Israel in the promised land was spoken of (Gen. xlix.). When Isaiah depicted the overthrow of Assyria, the coming Hero was predicted (Isa. vii.). When the fall of Babylon was announced, the days of Messiah were announced to be at hand. When the deliverance of Israel by the hand of Cyrus was predicted, Messiah similarly was expected. The prophets foresaw that, although Israel's deliverance was to come from Persia, Persia would finally become its oppressor. The Greek power commenced with spreading a sheltering wing over the Jewish nation. Greece in its turn became also Israel's oppressor. Hence it is described in the language of Zechariah as raising up its mighty men against Israel (Zech. ix. 13). Similarly, Daniel, in his last prophecy (ch. xii.), represents Messiah rising up in the form of a warrior, "Michael, the great prince," standing up for the children of His people. Finally, when the struggle with the last or fourth world-power is predicted, Messiah, the stone cut out of the mountain without human instrumentality, is pictured as dashing in pieces the great colossus of the four world-empires, and destroying His foes.

Thus the four winds of heaven were announced as breaking forth in tempestuous force over the sea of nations, on which rode the fragile vessel laden with Israel, described in the Psalms as "Jehovah's anointed," and as His "prophets" (Ps. cv. 15) for the benefit of humanity. And as the storms which in turn came forth from each quarter of the heavens severally expended their force,

the "still small voice" of prophecy announced on each occasion the coming of Messiah.

If the fact be borne in mind that Zechariah, in predicting the rebuilding of the Second Temple and its completion, spoke at the same time of the coming of the man who was the Branch, who, in a more glorious sense, would build the Temple of the Lord (Zech. vi. 12, 13), it cannot be regarded as improbable that Daniel in this vision may have been led to think of Messiah as the Restorer of the sanctuary which had been polluted alike by Jews and Gentiles.

No satisfactory interpretation has been given of the 2300 days regarded as referring to Maccabean times. It is quite possible that those 2300 days may be a period of prophetic days or years which have still to run their course. Ancient Jewish interpreters have made the same suggestion. The combination in Gen. i. 5 of "evening," "morning," "light" and "day" with that in Zech. xiv. 6, 7, where "day," "evening," "light" are spoken of, compared with "evening morning" in Dan. viii. 14, and "the evening and the morning" and "many days" in ver. 26, seems to show that Zechariah affords a hint of the real meaning of the passages in Daniel.¹ If that be correct, it need not surprise us that we are not permitted to know the date of the commencement of the period. If the cleansing be future, it will take place in that day when Messiah, in the language of the Baptist, shall "thoroughly cleanse his threshing-floor; and he will gather his wheat into the garner, but the chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire" (Matt. iii. 12).

¹ See *Bampton Lectures on Zechariah*, pp. 483-486.

CHAPTER VII

THE PROPHECY OF THE SEVENTY WEEKS

“IN the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, who was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans,” Daniel “understood by the books the number of the years, whereof the word of Jehovah came to Jeremiah the prophet, for the accomplishing of the desolations of Jerusalem, even seventy years.” Having learned from those sources that the period of the Babylonish captivity was past, or almost at an end, the prophet betook himself to fasting and prayer for Israel. While the words of intercession were yet in his mouth, the angel Gabriel was sent to make known to him that a day was coming when reconciliation would be made for iniquity, and everlasting righteousness would be brought in.

Daniel had pleaded for Israel's pardon and deliverance. Modern critics expound the angel's reply to intimate that, in place of the sin of Israel being forgiven at the close of the seventy years' captivity, five centuries were to elapse before it would be pardoned. The interpretation is opposed to the repeated promises of pardon set forth in the writings of the former prophets. Had such a prophecy been brought to light in the days of the Maccabean struggle, it must at once have been rejected.

Whether the prophecy be pre-Maccabean or post-

Maccabean is a point which ought, it is true, "to be decided on scientific grounds alone." Modern critics are not, however, unbiassed by dogmatic prepossessions. Those considerations may be entitled in their proper place to respect, but in a critical investigation they should be left out of sight.

That the seventy weeks of Daniel are weeks of years is an acknowledged fact, and it may also be admitted that the number seventy has some reference to the seventy years of captivity. The theory, however, that "the seventy weeks" were a prolongation of the "seventy years" is based upon two assumptions: (1) that the Book of Daniel is a product of the Maccabean era; and (2) that "the seventy years foretold by Jeremiah corresponded to seventy sabbatical years."

The latter idea is deduced from the 20th and 21st verses of 2 Chron. xxxvi: "To fulfil the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah, until the land had enjoyed her sabbaths: for as long as she lay desolate she kept sabbath, to fulfil threescore and ten years." Those "seventy years," according to the verses that follow, came to a close in the first year of Cyrus. On the modern hypothesis, it is therefore necessary to delete the concluding verses of the Chronicles, as being in reality part of the Book of Ezra, and to maintain that Chronicles and Ezra are contradictory. For while seventy sabbatical years would be 490 years, Ezra considered Jeremiah's seventy years to be literal years.

In proof of their theory critics appeal to Lev. xxvi. 34, 35: "Then shall the land enjoy her sabbaths, as long as it lieth desolate, and ye be in your enemies' land; even then shall the land rest, and enjoy her sabbaths. As long as it lieth desolate it shall have rest;

even the rest which it had not in your sabbaths, when ye dwelt upon it." That passage, however, is no proof that the writer of Daniel interpreted Jeremiah's seventy years as allegorical. Even the LXX. version preserves no trace of such an exegesis, which fact tells against the hypothesis. The Book of Enoch, in the account it gives of "the seventy shepherds," may, however, possibly contain the germ of such an exposition.

The seventy years of Jeremiah are a round number, and may be calculated from several different commencements, from the beginning of Jerusalem's final sorrows in the fourth year of Jehoiakim down to its final conquest and destruction by Nebuchadnezzar (see p. 205). The 43,000 individuals who returned with Zerubbabel were but a small portion of the Israelitish nation. Apathy and want of faith led to the fulfilment of the Divine promises being then postponed.

On the assumption that the writer, after the manner of later Midrashim, regarded Jeremiah's seventy years as seventy sabbatic years, *i.e.* 490 years, certain reasons have been suggested in favour of that conclusion.

Chapter ix. 2 states that in the first year of the reign of Darius the Mede "Daniel understood by the books the number of the years, whereof the word of Jehovah came to Jeremiah the prophet, for the accomplishing of the desolations of Jerusalem, even seventy years." With the books of Jeremiah, Ezra, and Nehemiah in our hands, the meaning of that statement is clear, even if it could be proved that the Book of Daniel was written as late as B.C. 164. Daniel lived until the reign of Cyrus, and was an eye-witness both of the Captivity and of the commencement of the Return. He might well have been grieved, or be represented as grieved, at the unwilling-

ness which the Jewish people exhibited to return to their own land.

In the prayer in Dan. ix. the Law of Moses is plainly alluded to. That prayer contains allusions to Lev. xxvi., where famine, blasting, pestilence, war, and captivity are threatened as the consequence of national disobedience. The prophetic warnings in Leviticus, that the Lord would punish Israel seven times for their sins, are, however, no proof that the writer multiplied the seventy years of Jeremiah by seven, in order to extend Israel's period of punishment to 490 years.

Behrmann correctly maintains that the Chronicler regarded the denunciations of Lev. xxvi. as accomplished in the first year of Cyrus. The same view was taken by the writer of Daniel. Isaiah's golden visions had not, indeed, been realised ; but Jeremiah nowhere states that all the prophecies would be accomplished immediately after the conclusion of the seventy years. Many prophecies, however, had been already fulfilled. Jerusalem had arisen from its dust and ashes. Some of the prophecies of Zechariah had been accomplished. And although full credence cannot be accorded to all the statements concerning the glory of Jerusalem contained in the *Letter of Aristæus*, or in the descriptions of Hecatæus and other pre-Christian writers, the desolations of Jerusalem were at an end long before the beginning of the Greek period of Jewish history. If the holy city during the latter period was given over for a short time into the hands of its enemies, such an event was brought about by the apostasy of priests, nobles, and people, which led to the days of oppression under Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors. The writer who, according to the modern hypothesis, composed the prayer ascribed to Daniel, could have been at no diffi-

culty to understand the reason why Jehovah had permitted Israel again to fall into the hands of the oppressor.

The modern view is chiefly built upon the baseless assumption that Daniel's period begins with the destruction of Jerusalem in the time of Jeremiah. The exact date or duration of Jeremiah's prophecy is immaterial. Jeremiah's "seventy years" are a round number expressing "a sabbatic period" of less than a century's duration.¹

From B.C. 588, when Jerusalem was burned with fire, down to B.C. 164, the close of Antiochus Epiphanes' reign, there elapsed a period of 424 years, and not of 490 years. That "difficulty" of an error of nearly seventy years in a prophecy supposed to have been written after the events had taken place, is "got over" on the plea that "it is absurd to expect accuracy in an apocalyptic book such as Daniel."

Behrmann, indeed, repudiates that method of meeting the difficulty. In their fixed determination to relegate the prophecy of Daniel to the Maccabean era, most modern critics, however, regard all such discrepancies as unimportant.

The writer of Daniel dates "the Seventy Weeks" from a commandment to restore and to build again Jerusalem. The new critics insist that the period must be dated from the destruction of Jerusalem! Daniel affirms that the period, from its commencement to its close, would be 490 years. The critics present a solution of Daniel which falls 66 years short of the period!

¹ A period of seventy years intervened between the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in the reign of Jehoiakim, in B.C. 606, and the capture of Babylon by Cyrus in B.C. 536. Another seventy years, in round numbers, elapsed between the final destruction of Jerusalem in B.C. 588 and the second year of Darius Hystaspes (B.C. 520), the date at which Zechariah saw his visions.

The seventy years of Jeremiah were years during which Jerusalem was "a wilderness and the Temple a desolation," the Holy Land was uncultivated and kept its sabbaths. The seventy weeks of Daniel commence either at the close of Jeremiah's "seventy years" or shortly after their expiration, when it was "time" for the Lord "to favour Zion," and "the set time had come" (Ps. cii. 13). Daniel's "seventy weeks" were a period of compensation for the days of degradation predicted by the earlier prophet. Daniel spoke of the rebuilding of the city and the restoration of its bulwarks, and announced that Jerusalem, rebuilt in troublous times, would not again be destroyed until nearly five centuries had passed away, and the long-promised Messiah had appeared.

On the hypothesis that the Messianic interpretation is correct, no such discrepancies exist as are involved on the modern theory. There are, indeed, difficulties connected with the Messianic exposition, but those difficulties are trifling when compared with those which beset the rival interpretation. The Messianic interpretation coincides better with the *terminus a quo* laid down in ver. 25, and with the *terminus ad quem* there pointed out, than any other scheme which has yet been propounded.

Six points, according to ver. 24, were to be accomplished within the space of the "Seventy Weeks." The prediction would have been detected as a clumsy fabrication, if, composed two years after the dedication of the Temple of Judas Maccabeus, it had asserted that iniquity was pardoned, everlasting righteousness brought in, and the Messianic age begun. The Jews of that time may have hoped that the Messianic times were at hand. But it would have been too great a tax on their credulity to have asserted that the blessings set forth in this 24th

verse had already been bestowed. Hence critics who explain the prediction as Maccabean, endeavour to make out that those promises were only to be fulfilled at an indefinite time after the close of the seventy weeks. That, however, is to put a most unnatural interpretation on the statements employed.

The forgiveness of sins in the prophets is constantly connected with promises of the return from captivity. All national captivities, whether partial, like those under the rule of the Judges, or general, like the Babylonian captivity, were viewed as the consequence of sin. A return from captivity had to be preceded, or accompanied, by a remission of transgressions (Isa. xl. 2 ff., xlv. 22 ; Jer. i. 12, etc.). The great expected deliverance by Messiah is often spoken of in close connection with the pardon of sin. The same thought pervades the Psalter. Hence the forgiveness of sin is mentioned as the first of the blessings to be brought to light at Messiah's appearance.

There is much in favour of the reading found in the K'thibh (or written text) in the second clause, namely, "*and to seal up transgressions.*" Internal and external evidence (with the exception of Theodotion) is, however, in favour of the correction of the Q'rē, "*and to make an end of transgression.*" "*Making an end of transgressions*" must mean something equivalent to the comforting words used in Isa. xl. 2.¹

The third clause, "*and to make atonement for (properly to cover over) iniquity,*" represents a further step towards admission into the Divine favour by the removal of the

¹ The external evidence is also in the same direction. No satisfactory appeal, in such cases, can be made to the readings of the Hebrew MSS., because many MSS., as a matter of course, adopt the reading of the Q'rē. See *Crit. Comm.*

obstacles in the way of reconciliation. Jehovah is regarded as the Author of each successive act. He puts an end to transgression by consuming it (compare Ps. lxxviii. 33). The nation's filthiness is consumed out of the midst of them (Ezek. xxii. 15), and the iniquity of the land removed in one day (Zech. iii. 9). Jehovah covers over the sin of His people, and makes atonement for their iniquity.

These three Divine acts connected with the forgiveness of the people were, however, only preparatory to three other acts of grace mentioned in the subsequent clauses.¹ The three latter clauses of the verse describe the spiritual transformation and restoration of the nation. The first of these is *the bringing in of everlasting righteousness*. Bertholdt supposes this to mean the restoration of the prosperity of former times, when the nation was free from political and religious oppression. The explanation is a specimen of the attempts made by some critics to reduce to their own level the thoughts of the Hebrew prophets.

Righteousness is a well-known theological term of the earlier books. The "righteousness" brought in by Jehovah is "everlasting" because, like the Messianic kingdom itself (Dan. ii. 44, vii. 18, 27), it endures for ever, and is not to be abolished (Isa. li. 6).

"*To seal vision and prophet.*" The translation is undisputed. A seal was affixed for the purpose of accrediting an act or decree (Dan. vi. 18; 1 Kings xxi. 8); to seal

¹ The Massorettes have, therefore, shown exegetical tact in placing the great distinctive *zakeph qaton* on the word *iniquity*. They have thus drawn a line of demarcation between the three clauses that precede and the three that follow after. The *zakeph qaton* does not, however, prevent the clause immediately following from being, under another aspect, viewed as parallel to the clause which speaks of atonement having been made for iniquity.

a vision is to confirm its truth by fulfilment. *Vision* and *prophet*, being without the article, are used in a general sense. "Vision" describes whatever the prophets "saw" in their divine dreams concerning Messianic times. The "vision" has, therefore, no particular reference to Jeremiah's prophecy of the seventy years' captivity, as Hitzig imagines. The A.V. and the R.V., after the Vulgate, regard "prophet" as nearly synonymous with "vision," and translate the former word by "prophecy," which rendering has the support of eminent critics. It is, however, open to question. There is nothing to indicate that any vision of Daniel's is specially referred to, while "prophet" may be interpreted of "prophets" in general.

The prophecy is couched in general terms, and marked by that indeterminateness which often characterises genuine prophecies. The use of general terms does not, however, exclude the idea of a particular reference to the prophet who was to be revealed in the latter times. Our Lord speaks of Messiah as "him hath God the Father sealed" (John vi. 27), and affirms in reference to His own testimony that "he that hath received his (Messiah's) witness hath set his seal to this, that God is true" (John iii. 33). The sealing in the passage (as Hitzig admits) is to be regarded as an act of the Most High, who, by the fulfilment of His purposes, ratifies all visions in which His purposes were revealed to men, and puts His seal upon the prophets as the channels of revelation.

Considerable controversy exists as to the meaning of the last phrase. The view generally held by modern critics with regard to "holy of holies" is thus tersely put by Professor Bevan: "The last act is *to anoint the most holy thing, i.e. to consecrate the altar in the Temple,*

which, when the author wrote, was given up to the heathen worship. Some early Christians and some mediæval Jews discovered an allusion to the Messiah in this passage (see the Peshitta and Ben Ezra), but the phrase 'holy of holies,' which occurs more than forty times in the Old Testament, never refers to persons, always to things, and is used especially of the altar of sacrifice (Exod. xxix. 36, 37, xxx. 29, xl. 10)."

The statement is, however, incorrect. The phrase "holy of holies," inclusive of the passage before us, occurs forty-two times in the Hebrew Scriptures. In *eleven* cases (*i.e.* in more than a quarter of the whole) it describes the innermost sanctuary, "the holy of holies." In *six* passages it is used of the portion of the sacrifices eaten by the priests; in *four* places, of the *minchâ*; in *three*, of the "sin-offering." In *three* passages it refers to the "trespass" or "guilt-offering." It is *twice* used of the furniture of the tabernacle in general (Num. iv. 4, 19), and *once* of the shewbread (Lev. xxiv. 9). Ezekiel employs the term *once* to denote holy things in general (Ezek. xliv. 13); *once* of the sanctuary as a whole (Ezek. xlv. 3); *once* also of the Levitical oblation of land (Ezek. xlviii. 12), and of the limits around the Temple seen in his vision (Ezek. xliii. 12). Notwithstanding, therefore, the statement of critics that the phrase is "used specially of the altar of sacrifice," the phrase is only used *three* times to denote the *altar* by itself (Exod. xxix. 37, xxx. 10, xl. 10), and in another passage is used in reference to the *altar* in combination with the *laver* (Exod. xxx. 29).¹

¹ In one passage the phrase certainly refers to *persons*. Both *men* and *beasts*, when regarded as "banned" or *devoted* to death, are in Lev. xxvii. 28, 29 spoken of as "holy of holies." It might fairly be argued that *persons* are likewise so termed in 1 Chron. xxiii. 13.

It is, therefore, remarkable that "holy of holies" is so rarely used of the altar. These facts disprove the assertion that the phrase employed in this verse must mean "to consecrate the altar in the temple." The LXX. did not thus understand the term, although they interpreted the prophecy of Maccabean times. Their translation is as follows:—

"Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon the city Sion, that the sin be accomplished, and that the sins become rare, and to wipe away the sins, and the vision be understood, and everlasting righteousness be given, and the vision and prophet be fulfilled, and to gladden a holy of holies."

By the "holy of holies" those translators understood the Temple, and probably its innermost shrine. The LXX. could scarcely have avoided interpreting it of "altar," had they regarded that to be the real signification. For they transposed the letters of the phrase used for "to anoint" into "to rejoice," or "gladden,"¹ in order to make the clause refer to the gladness of the Jews on the occasion of the rededication of the Temple and of the altar described in 1 Macc. iv. 5 ff.

But if it were true that the phrase "holy of holies" was exclusively applicable to *things*, the Messianic interpretation would not be even weakened. In announcing to the Virgin the birth of Jesus, "the Son of the Most High" (Luke i. 31, 32), the angel spoke of him as "*the holy thing*."² Christ spoke of His own body as "this temple" (John ii. 19), and the writer of the Epistle to

It is not, however, necessary to discuss the latter passage, because our argument does not require us to demonstrate that the phrase is employed to designate *persons*.

¹ See *Crit. Comm.*

² καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται Υἱὸς θεοῦ (Luke i. 35).

the Hebrews refers to Christ's human body when he speaks of Jesus as "a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man" (Heb. viii. 2). The "body" of Christ offered on the cross is compared in the latter passage with the offerings of the old Law. All sacrifices of the bodies of beasts are done away with for ever; believers under the New Covenant are "sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all"¹ (Heb. x. 10).

Many scholars who maintain that the cleansing and rededication of the altar of Judas Maccabeus are the subject of the verse, admit that the passage points to Messianic times, of which they consider the writer deemed the reconsecration of the Temple to be the dawn. No grander expressions have been used of Messianic days by any of the prophets, and no language more suitably depicts the Christian era and its blessings, than those six sentences of Daniel which speak of the six acts of Divine grace to be performed within the compass of the "Seventy Weeks."

The New Testament writers affirm that the sacrifices of the Old Testament in some way or other point to Christ's sacrifice on the cross. They teach that *minchā*, sin-offering, and trespass-offering were completed and put an end to by the atoning death of the Lamb of God. They represent Christ's people as feeding by faith on the sacrifice of Christ, as the priests and people in some cases fed on the flesh of the legal sacrifices. The *shewbread* typified the twelve tribes of Israel and the Messiah Himself, as Israel's true representative, "the bread of

¹ Hävernack aptly refers to the passage in Isa. viii. 4, where Jehovah Himself is spoken of as "a sanctuary." The text of Isaiah is quoted as Messianic in 1 Peter ii. 8.

God which came down from heaven." The *holy of holies*, with its *ark* and mysterious *mercy-seat* sprinkled with blood, is explained in the Epistle to the Hebrews as shadowing forth Christ and "the blood of sprinkling which speaketh better things than that of Abel." Messiah's body is represented as *temple* and *sanctuary*; and the Messiah is depicted in Isa. liii. as "banned," *devoted* (חָרַם) to death by Jehovah—"made sin for us," as St Paul expounds it. If these things be true, Messiah, "anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power," may most suitably be regarded as pointed out by the name "holy of holies," which appellation has been employed to denote each and all of those Old Testament "shadows of better things to come."

The expressions in ver. 25 are irreconcilable with the modern critical theory, according to which Daniel's Seventy Weeks are supposed to commence from the destruction of Jerusalem. The LXX. translation of Daniel was executed not later than forty years after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes. The LXX. expound the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks as depicting the events of the Maccabean period. But in order to give an air of probability to that exposition, those translators omit the important sentences, "*from the going forth of a commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto an anointed one, a prince, shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks*" (ver. 25), while they transfer others to ver. 27, to enable them to interpret the prophecy of Maccabean times. Ver. 25 is thus reduced to the following:—

"And thou shalt know and meditate over, and shalt be gladdened, and shalt find commands to be answered, and shalt build Jerusalem a city to the Lord."

This attempt of the LXX. to rewrite the verse is of

importance ; for it shows the alterations which those early translators deemed necessary to make the prophecy a picture of the Maccabean struggles. They did not dream of the happy expedient (now popular with critics) of putting back the commencement of the seventy weeks to the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

When Jeremiah predicted (ch. xxv. 11, 15) the seventy years' captivity, he announced at its close the punishment of the king of Babylon and the Chaldeans, which prediction, taken in connection with other prophecies, points in the direction of the restoration of Israel, although Jeremiah did not at that time predict the return from captivity. In a later passage (ch. xxix. 10) he speaks of "the seventy years," and predicts the restoration of the people of Israel (ch. xxx. 18-22). The former prophecy of Jeremiah was delivered in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, *i.e.* B.C. 605-4. If the first of the three periods spoken of in Daniel's prophecy (namely, seven prophetic weeks, or forty-nine years) be calculated from that year, it would have expired in B.C. 556, twenty years prior to Cyrus' edict for the restoration of the Jews, B.C. 536.

The latter prophecy of Jeremiah (ch. xxix.) was delivered in the first year of Zedekiah, the year of the deportation of Jehoiachin (B.C. 597-6). Forty-nine years from that date bring us to B.C. 548, twelve years before the "establishment of the Jewish worship under Joshua son of Jozadak," who, in the seventh month after the edict of Cyrus (B.C. 536), "builded the altar of the God of Israel" upon the ruins of the ancient temple (Ezra iii. 2, 3). As the latter date is that assigned by Professor Bevan for the conclusion of the first seven of Daniel's seventy weeks, his exposition does not correspond with the words of the prophecy.

The commencement of the Babylonish captivity is reckoned in Scripture from two different eras. The more common of these is the year when, after a short reign of only three months' duration, Jehoiachin, the son of Jehoiakim, was carried into captivity by Nebuchadnezzar, together with 10,000 of the most important inhabitants of Jerusalem. This was, as already stated, B.C. 597-6. As Ezekiel was among those captives, he dates from that era, which he terms "king Jehoiachin's captivity" (Ezek. xxxiii. 21, xl. 1). Jeremiah has often been supposed, though incorrectly, to date the seventy years from the same epoch (Jer. xxix. 1, 2, 10), but it is not necessary to put such an interpretation upon the passages referred to. If, however, the seventy years be calculated from it, they must have terminated about B.C. 527-6, ten years after the decree of Cyrus which permitted the Jews to return to their land.

Jerusalem was taken and destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar ten or eleven years after the captivity of Jehoiachin, in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, or B.C. 587-6, when the nation was carried into captivity. That captivity is mentioned by Ezekiel (xl. 1) and by Jeremiah (i. 3, etc.). There is, however, no evidence that that year was regarded as the commencement of the predicted "seventy years." Calculated from that period, the seventy years expired B.C. 517-6, in the reign of Darius Hystaspes, at a date when the work of the rebuilding of the Temple was far advanced. Hence it is better to regard the seventy years as a round number than as an exactly defined period.

On the supposition that the Messianic interpretation is correct, there is no such discrepancy as that of sixty-six years between the dates set forth in the prophecy. The Seventy Weeks calculated from the going forth of

Artaxerxes' commandment to restore Jerusalem unto the days of Christ fairly correspond. There are difficulties connected with that exposition, but it has the advantage of agreeing more closely with the *terminus a quo* laid down in ver. 25, and with the *terminus ad quem* there referred to, than any other scheme yet proposed.

Professor Bevan, with other eminent scholars, maintains that the division of ver. 25 in the R.V. is more correct than that in the A.V. In ver. 25, in the R.V., a colon is placed at the end of the first clause to mark it off from what follows: "*Know therefore and discern that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the anointed one, the prince, shall be seven weeks:*" The meaning then is, not that 69 weeks, or 483 years, were to elapse before the Messianic age, but that some individual called "the anointed one the prince" was to appear at the close of the first of the three periods (7 + 62 + 1) which together make up the Seventy Weeks. The Massorettes, it is asserted, have placed the strong disjunctive (athnach) under the numeral to cut off the first "seven" from the two other periods, and to indicate that the "anointed one" of ver. 25 (Messiah, without the article) was to appear within the first half-century.

The punctuation of the Massorettes cannot in all cases be slavishly adhered to. It was added to the text centuries after Christ. The Massoretic punctuation is, however, unquestionably of high value, and it has preserved the grammatical forms of the Hebrew language. The accents are probably much later than the vowel-points. The location of the numeral *seven* in the passage is peculiar, and the Massorettes call attention in various ways to peculiarities in the sacred text. Thus, an emphatic athnach is placed between the subject and the object of

the verb in the verse : " In the beginning God created : the heavens and the earth." So between the noun and the qualifying participle in Dan. vi. 12 : " Then these men assembled together and found Daniel | making petition and supplication before his God." Similarly in Dan. ii. 12 : " For this cause the king (Nebuchadnezzar) was angry and very furious |(athnach), and commanded to destroy |(zakeph qaton) all the wise men of Babylon." Similar emphatic punctuation, for the purpose of calling attention to Midrash teaching, is found in Gen. i. 21 : " And God created the great monsters | and every living thing," etc., and Gen. xxxiii. 4 : " And Esau ran to meet him (Jacob), and embraced him |(zakeph qaton), and fell upon his neck, and kissed him |(athnach) : and they wept."

Dr Wickes, *Hebrew Prose Accents*, pp. 32-35, has some valuable remarks on this point. Peculiarities in punctuation, accentuation, and subdivision of the Hebrew text were designed to convey exegetical and grammatical hints of various kinds. Some of the exegetical hints have been fortunately preserved by tradition, although in most instances the key to their interpretation has been lost.

The position which the number *seven* occupies in the verse required a disjunctive accent to secure for it attention. The accentuators desired to emphasise the fact that the Seventy Weeks contained three subdivisions : (1) 7 weeks, or 49 years, or, in round numbers, half a century ; (2) 62 weeks, or 434 years ; and (3) 1 week, or 7 years, with which subdivision the period of 70 weeks, or 490 years, closes.

" *The going forth of the commandment*" (ver. 25) is, by most moderns, explained to refer to a Divine decree. They consider that Divine commandment went forth at

the commencement or close of Daniel's prayer. The LXX. translators, perhaps, took the same view.¹

As the LXX. version of Daniel can be traced up to a period of 100 or 120 years before Christ, or almost to the Maccabean era, it is important to observe that the LXX. did not explain the clause "*until an anointed one, a prince,*" to indicate an individual who was to appear at the close of the first period of the Seventy Weeks. The LXX. omit all the words of ver. 25 in which a *terminus a quo* is assigned to the prophecy, namely, "*from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the anointed one, the prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks.*"

Moreover, the LXX., with some peculiarity of rendering, transfer the clause "*it shall be built again with street and moat*" to ver. 27, omitting there the words "*even in troublous times.*" Those words are introduced in another form into ver. 27 (see the *Crit. Comm.*). Ver. 25 is presented in the following truncated form: "*And thou shalt know and meditate over, and shalt find commands to be answered, and shalt build Jerusalem a city to the Lord.*"

Such a paraphrase would have been impossible had the passage been understood in Maccabean times to signify that the first 49 years (of the 490) include (1) the time which elapsed between the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar (B.C. 588) and the date of Cyrus' conquest (B.C. 537), or of the permission granted by that monarch for the rebuilding of the Temple (B.C. 536). (2) They may include the period up to "the re-establishment of the Jewish worship under Joshua son of Jozadak," as high priest, which took place shortly afterwards.

Lev. iv. 3, 5, 16, vi. 15, prove that it is possible to

¹ See *Crit. Comm.* Note also remarks on p. 213 of this chapter.

apply the term "Messiah" to the high priest; but only in the combination "the anointed priest," in which case there was no danger of the word being regarded as a noun or proper name.

The Seventy Weeks begin with the going forth of a commandment (Divine or human) to restore and to build Jerusalem. The commencement of the Seventy Weeks cannot, therefore, date from the fourth year of Zedekiah, when Jeremiah's prophecy (Jer. xxix. 10 ff.) was delivered, *i.e.* from B.C. 595 or 593, or from the year mentioned in Jer. xxv. 1, 11, which was the fourth year of Jehoiakim, B.C. 606 or 604, that being the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, when the Egyptians were overthrown in the battle of Carchemish. The dark storm of desolation had not at these periods descended upon Jerusalem. No commandment, Divine or human, could then have gone forth "to restore and rebuild." The cry then was, "Take away her battlements, for they are not the Lord's" (Jer. v. 10).

Behrmann considers the first "seven weeks," or forty-nine years, to run from B.C. 606 (the fourth year of Jehoiakim) to the year of Cyrus' accession, B.C. 558. He thus makes the period to close twenty years before Cyrus overthrew the Babylonian kingdom. He argues that, although the government of Cyrus over Babylon dates from the conquest of that city, it is not unlikely that the general expression "unto Messiah a prince" refers to the actual commencement of Cyrus' sovereignty twenty years earlier. Even on that assumption Behrmann's exposition does not accord with the prophecy. From B.C. 606 to the year of desolation in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes (B.C. 168-165) there elapsed only sixty-three weeks of years in place of seventy. Behrmann thinks

that the author forgot to notice the fact that the first-mentioned seven weeks were included within the sixty-two. Thus the writer is represented as unable to do a simple sum in arithmetic.¹

The prophet, moreover, distinctly affirms that the beginning of the Seventy Weeks is to be dated from the going forth of a commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem. Modern critics maintain the period is to be dated from the commencement of Jerusalem's ruin. No critical manipulation can prove that Daniel could have conceived the beginning of the desolations of Jerusalem to be the time when the commandment went forth "to restore and to rebuild" the city.

This argument is fatal to the interpretation advocated by other critics, and popularised by Dean Farrar. Those critics date the commencement of the period from a different epoch than the writer of the Book of Daniel. Their scheme breaks down when considered in detail. It is true that nearly forty-nine years elapsed between the destruction of Jerusalem in B.C. 588 and the time of Joshua the son of Jozadak (B.C. 536). But from the date of the restoration of Temple and priest to the deposition and murder of Onias III. in B.C. 171 (which these critics think is alluded to) there is a want of agreement of over sixty-six years; and even the period of the last seven years requires divers corrections of the Hebrew text in order to make it fit even loosely into the framework of the prophecy.

Whether the prophecy be genuine or fictitious, the date for its commencement is "the going forth" of some "commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem."

¹ The same explanation is given, however, by Eichhorn, von Ammon, and Hitzig.

Critics have a right to examine into the genuineness or fictitious character of the prophecy, and to pass judgment upon its fulfilment or non-fulfilment. They have no right to manipulate its clauses so as to make the prophecy teach what it does not. Their duty is to interpret, not to rewrite the text.

The prophet Daniel might well have been in ignorance whether "the going forth of a commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem" referred to the decree which Cyrus had already issued, or to some decree to be issued later. There is nothing to justify the remark that all theories "contradict the text" which make the *terminus a quo* of the prophecy the seventh or twentieth year of Artaxerxes, because Daniel could not be said to "understand the vision" "if the *terminus a quo* upon which the whole matter depended were an event that took place some seventy or eighty years after his death" (*Bevan*, p. 147). Is it necessary to remind critics that there are prophecies in the Book of the Revelation in which both the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem* were alike unknown (or supposed to be unknown) to the original writer, as being avowedly future events? The author of the Book of the Revelation did not know the era of the commencement or end of "the thousand years," or of the period when Gog and Magog were to burst forth after that Satan is loosed out of the prison (Rev. xx.). Whether those prophecies be true or not, this at least may be affirmed. From some "decree" or "commandment," past, present, or future in the prophet's time, according to which Jerusalem was to be restored and rebuilt, the writer of the Book of Daniel distinctly says the period of seventy weeks was to commence its course.

The Septuagint translators perceived the difficulty

connected with the *terminus a quo* mentioned in ver. 25. They met it by the crucial method of the total excision of the clause. There was much in the age in which they lived to lead them to adopt some such interpretation. But in a day of clearer light, in which sounder principles of exegesis ought to prevail, the manner in which the LXX. translators sought to adapt the prophecy to the history of their own times is a beacon-light to warn off from the rocks upon which so many critics have suffered shipwreck.

The confusion of thought presented by the LXX. does not arise from the corrupt state of the Greek text of that version. It arose from the predetermination of those translators to treat the prophecy as a description of events connected with the Maccabean era, and from their anxiety at the same time to preserve some resemblance to the original Hebrew. Early interpreters of Scripture have rarely recognised the necessity of harmonious exposition of the details of a passage. They were generally satisfied if able to expound in any passage a few points in which they fancied a likeness might be detected to the point which they imagined was referred to. They were generally indifferent as to whether the sentences immediately preceding or following had any connection whatever with the subject-matter of the exposition.

Ver. 25 is thus rendered in the R.V. :—“*Know therefore and discern¹ that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the anointed one, the prince,² shall be seven weeks : and threescore and two weeks, it shall be built again, with street and moat, even in troublous times.*”

¹ A.V. “understand.”

² The margin of the R.V. is “unto Messiah, the prince,” which is practically identical with the A.V. “unto the Messiah, the Prince.”

The LXX. is as follows :—“ *And thou shalt know and meditate over, and shalt be gladdened, and shalt find commands to be answered, and shalt build Jerusalem a city to the Lord.*” In that Greek paraphrase not a single clause of the original Hebrew remains intact. The date from whence the prophecy was to commence disappears. The clause “ *unto the anointed one, the prince* ” (in ver. 25) is likewise erased. The only idea which the verse retains in common with the Hebrew is that concerning a rebuilding of Jerusalem. The last clause of the verse is transferred to ver. 27, and the significant words “ *even in troublous times* ” are omitted.

But although the verse in the LXX. has thus been reduced to a form entirely different from the original, in its mangled shape it is still of interest. We have already noticed the LXX. interpretation of “ *commandment* ” (p. 208). In the clause “ *and thou shalt find commands to be answered,*” reference is made to the Divine command or “ *commandment,*” which, according to ver. 23, went forth at the commencement of Daniel’s prayer.¹

The translators apparently thought of the purification of the Temple narrated in 1 Macc. iv. 46. That historian states that the altar of burnt offering, which had been polluted by the heathen, was completely pulled down, and the stones of which that altar had been built were deposited on the Temple mountain in a fitting place, “ *until there should come a prophet to give answer concerning them.*” And as the LXX. were resolved to explain Daniel’s prophecy as a prediction of that great event in Jewish history, the translators did not hesitate

¹ The clause with which the verse closes, namely, “ *understand the vision,*” is rendered in the LXX. *διανοήθητι τὸ πρόσταγμα,* “ *meditate over the commandment.*” See *Critical Commentary.*

to alter the text in order to render the exposition possible.

In ver. 26 the LXX. render: "*And after seven and seventy and sixty-two an anointing shall be removed and shall not be.*" The numbers in the opening part of the verse according to the LXX. were corrected after ver. 25. The Hebrew presents the collocation "*weeks seven and weeks sixty and two.*" The phrase "*and weeks*" was in the unpointed text misread by the LXX. "*and seventy*"; and thus they obtained "*and after seven and seventy and sixty-two,*" which, added together ($7 + 70 + 62$), make the number 139.

The peculiar collocation of the numeral "*seven*" in ver. 25—adopted by the sacred writer with a distinct object in view—has proved a source of perplexity to ancient as well as to modern critics. The LXX. translators sought to utilise that collocation in their interpretation of the prophecy. Hävernick long ago drew attention to the significance of the number 139 thus introduced into the prophecy. Antiochus Epiphanes, the persecutor of the Jews, ascended the throne of Syria in the year 138 of the Seleucidian era. The difference of a year was of small importance in the eyes of the LXX. expositors. Those translators exhibited no disposition to harmonise the prophecy in its minor details with the events of the age of which they expounded it. They were satisfied, by a manipulation of the original text, to draw attention to a few coincidences, and to leave other matters enveloped in mist.

The clause rendered "*an anointing shall be removed and shall not be,*"¹ the LXX. expounded of the desecration of the Temple and its holy vessels. When the tabernacle

¹ See *Critical Commentary*.

was set up in the wilderness, it and all the furniture thereof were solemnly anointed with holy oil (Exod. xxx. 26 ff.). A profanation of the Temple and its holy things might, therefore, conceivably be indicated by a removal of the anointing. By that removal the holy vessels and the other sacred things would become unholy. The "kingdom of Gentiles" (LXX., ver. 26) which destroyed the city and holy place was understood to mean the heathen kingdom of Antiochus. "The anointed one" (LXX., ver. 26) corrupted and destroyed was expounded of the last lawful high priest, Onias III. That priest was in no sense either a "confessor" or a "martyr," and, according to 2 Macc. iv., was deposed by Antiochus Epiphanes at the commencement of his reign, and afterwards put to death by the Syrian noble Andronicus, with or without the connivance of the king. The peculiar phraseology used in the LXX. translation of this prophecy of Daniel occurs also in 1 Maccabees in the record of the events of that period.

The R.V. renders ver. 27: "*And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week:¹ and for the half of the week² he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation³ to cease; and upon the wing of abominations⁴ shall come⁵ one that maketh desolate;⁶ and even unto⁷ the consummation and that determined, shall wrath be poured out upon the desolator.*"⁸

¹ A.V. "he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week."

² A.V. and marginal rendering of R.V. "and in the midst of the week."

³ Marg. rend. of R.V. "the meal offering."

⁴ A.V. "and for the overspreading of abominations"; marg. rend. of R.V. "upon the pinnacle of abominations."

⁵ Margin "shall be."

⁶ A.V. "he shall make it desolate."

⁷ A.V. "until."

⁸ A.V. "the desolatee."

The manner in which the LXX. set about the task of accommodating the prophecy of Daniel to the events of the Maccabean era is peculiar. They worked up into their paraphrase most of the words and clauses found in the original prophecy, with the exception of the date in ver. 25 from which the prophecy was to run its course.

The LXX. interpreters resemble the critics of our day, who start with a preconceived determination of obliterating from any prophecy all traces of the prediction of future events. On such an assumption it is possible, in commenting on the prophet Isaiah, to speak with Giesebrecht—"von einer gradezu kolossalen Zerstörung des Textes"—of a colossal corruption of the text. Such a corruption being assumed, the next step is to arrange the prophetic text in some shape or form which may please the imagination of the critic. No such imaginary reconstructions of the old Hebrew prophets, however much the ingenuity of the critic as architect and builder may for a time be admired, are really "scientific," or are destined long to survive close examination.

There is no need to comment at length upon the manner in which the 27th verse of Daniel ix. was re-edited by the LXX. interpreters in order to make its clauses harmonise in some degree with the events of the Maccabean epoch. The first clause of the verse was entirely rewritten. The words "*he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week*" are rewritten as—"and the covenant shall have power with many." The inconvenient clause "*for one week*" was excised. Thus the verse was made to mean that the sacred covenant made by Jehovah with His people had power over many of the Jews even in the day of apostasy with which the

Maccabean period commenced. The introduction into the passage of the clause about the building of Jerusalem, which originally stood in ver. 25, was no doubt awkward. But an ancient interpreter was not disposed to be over-critical, or to find a real difficulty in a few disjointed sentences.

The number 139, which at first excited the interpreters' fancy, was reintroduced into ver. 27 in the awkward shape "*after seven and seventy times and sixty-two years.*" In that form it perhaps presented to their imagination a more Danielic appearance.

Those Greek translators had evidently no conception of any difference in meaning between "times" and "years." The phrases which follow—"*until a time of consummation of war,*" i.e. until a time of the end of the war, "*and the desolation shall be taken away,*" were fashioned partly after the model of the last clause of ver. 26. The next clause, namely, "*through the prevailing of the covenant for many weeks,*" may be a duplicate rendering of the opening sentence, which the translators had already mistranslated and misapplied. The duplicate did not come into existence by any mistake of copyists. The repetition of the thought in its new form was the work of men bent upon getting rid of the sense conveyed by the Hebrew phrase. The numeral "one" in the Hebrew was, as before, erased, and the singular "week" changed into the plural "weeks."

The writer of 1 Maccabees had in view this prophecy of Daniel when he spoke of the power which "the covenant" possessed with the pious Jews of that trying period. The men who followed Mattathias into the mountain fastnesses of the Holy Land are described as all zealous for the Law, and all maintainers of the covenant

(1 Macc. ii. 27). Mattathias on his dying bed exhorted his sons to be "zealous for the law, and to give their lives for the covenant of their fathers" (1 Macc. ii. 50).

The LXX. clearly understood the prophecy to refer to the chief events connected with that great struggle for civil and religious liberty. Some of the clauses might, indeed, bear such an interpretation; but considered as a whole, the prophecy cannot fairly be expounded of that period.

As, however, the LXX. did thus explain it, they transferred to the closing verse of the prophecy the sentences which speak of the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the fortification of the city. Had those clauses been retained in ver. 24, they must necessarily have been interpreted of the rebuilding and fortification of the city centuries before the Maccabean era. But the LXX. recast the prophecy into such a form that the reconstruction of the holy city in the Maccabean era might appear to be the subject of the prediction.

It would be, perhaps, unwise to lay too much stress upon the resemblance between the LXX. translation of the Book of Daniel and the first Book of Maccabees. It is, however, interesting to note the modifications of the original text of Daniel which were deemed necessary by the LXX. interpreters in order to convert the prophecy of Daniel into a prediction of the Maccabean times. Modern critics, in their efforts to uphold interpretations in which the passage is expounded of Maccabean days, have been driven by the necessities of the case similarly to emend or "deprave" the original text.

The translators of the LXX. version of Daniel and the writer of 1 Maccabees had much in common. Both belonged to the "moderate" party among the Jews.

They were alike intensely Jewish in feeling and in aspirations. Both were inclined to view things from a naturalistic standpoint. Both admired the Maccabean chieftains who had dared and done so much for the cause of Jewish independence and religion. Many priests, with the aristocrats of that day, held similar views, and the political and military leaders of the nation were disposed, after the bloody struggles through which they had passed, to "rest and be thankful." They did not like religious enthusiasm, nor desire thorough reformation.

The liberal party were, however, checked in their progress towards Sadduceism by the knowledge that the sentiments they held were not in harmony with the views of the nation. The sympathies of "the masses" were on the side of the Pharisees, who were the Puritan party of that day. The Chasidim, or the pious, the Assidæans of 1 Maccabees, desired the restoration of primitive practices and a revival of the dogmas of the Jewish faith. The Pharisaic party conceived the "wall of partition" erected between the Jews and the Gentiles to be too weak and inefficient to "close in" the Jews. They therefore strove to erect a new "fence" outside the ancient enclosure, by imposing on the necks of the people the traditions and decisions of the fathers, in addition to the law of Moses. The Pharisaic party was then powerful on account of popular favour, religious zeal, and fervent faith. It was a party which could not be ignored.

It is necessary now to notice some of the changes which modern scholars have proposed to introduce into the Hebrew text of this prophecy of Daniel, in order to make it distinctly Maccabean.

In ver. 25, in place of the Hebrew, which has "10

restore and to build," Professor Bevan proposes to read "*to people and to build*."

Bevan's objection to the Massoretic reading is that the verb has to be taken in a literal sense, whereas in the end of the verse it must be understood in a derived. The objection, however, is of little weight, because the verbs are in different forms; while the proposed alteration has no support from MSS. or VSS. The alteration would go far to destroy the evidence in favour of the traditional interpretation of the prophecy as referring to the decree of a Persian monarch authorising the restoration and rebuilding of Jerusalem. If the prophecy had been written after the days of Ezra and Nehemiah, its author could not have been ignorant of the fact that the repopulation of the city took place before the city itself had been rebuilt. The omission of all mention of the city having been re-peopled before the walls were rebuilt is evidence in favour of the early composition of the prophecy. The prophets, in announcing the return from Babylon, generally predict the re-peopling and rebuilding of the city as simultaneous. Daniel speaks of the restoration and rebuilding of the city without any mention whatever of its repopulation.

The interpretation of the phrase (in ver. 25) in the R.V. "*street and moat*," is a point on which much discussion has been expended. The first word is explained as a *public place (forum)* or *street*. It probably denotes the open places in the city (see Jer. v. 1, where the word is used in the plural). The second word has been variously explained. Ewald, Cornill, and others (following in the wake of Gesenius, Winer, and Hävernicks) render the word *trench* or *moat*, which now has been proved by the Assyrian to be its correct meaning.¹

¹ See *Critical Commentary*.

The place marked out for the site of a future city in a flat country was surrounded with a trench before the work of building walls began. Jerusalem, when rebuilt, was protected by walls and towers rather than by moats. It is significant that while the open places and trenches of the city are mentioned, no allusion is made to walls, without which no ancient city was complete. The prophecy, according to Ewald, describes the restoration of the city in its earliest stages, and this is another indication in favour of its composition prior to the Maccabean era.

Hence there is no necessity for altering the Massoretic text, or for proposing brand-new combinations of the Hebrew words, with which many critics, in defiance of MSS. or ancient versions, have amused themselves. The verbs with which the nouns are connected are in the feminine singular; the nouns are of different genders, the nearest being masculine. This affords an indication that the nouns were used in a collective signification. Comp. Gen. vi. 16, Ges.-Kautzsch, § 122. 4 *c*. Hence the grammar of the clause presents no difficulty; and it is arbitrary to divide the nouns, and to unite "*and trench*" with the sentence following, assigning to it some imaginary signification.

The ancient versions read the text as pointed by the Massorettes, and their translations are not to be hastily condemned as "mere guesses." The rendering of the LXX., "*in breadth and length*," is a paraphrase founded on the idea that the trenches surrounding the city marked its dimensions. The breadth of the city was supposed to be specially indicated by "*street*." Zechariah's vision describes Jerusalem as composed of villages, on account of the multitudes unable to find room within its walls (Zech. ii. 3, 4).¹

¹ Compare also the prophecy in Ezek. xxxviii. 11.

The clause "*and in a stress of times, in troublous times,*" has not been allowed to pass without attempts at emendation. The meaning of the verb is indisputable. Although the noun derived from that verb occurs only in this place, a closely related feminine noun is found in the same signification (see *Crit. Comm.*). In opposition to the testimony of MSS. and versions, Bevan proposes to rewrite the passage, and to connect it with the next verse as follows: "*And in the end of the times (after the sixty-two weeks) shall an anointed one be cut off.*" The clause "*after the sixty and two weeks*" is placed by Bevan in brackets, because that scholar chooses to regard it as an interpolation.

Thus another substantial portion of the old prophecy, the building up of the walls of Jerusalem in troublous times, spoken of in Ezra and Nehemiah, is, on the simple assertion of the critic, conveniently got rid of, and the prophecy is forced into another mould in order to make it coincide with the Maccabean era.

The modern critic has here, no doubt, closely trodden in the footsteps of the ancient Egyptian translators. The LXX., as already mentioned, took the liberty of transferring all these clauses (which belong to ver. 25) to ver. 27, in order to render it possible to explain them of the rebuilding of the city after its desolation by Antiochus Epiphanes.

The clause "*and after the threescore and two weeks shall an anointed one (Messiah) be cut off*" is one of the few clauses, or portions of a clause, allowed to pass without correction. The period of the Seventy Weeks is subdivided into three distinct portions, the first consisting of 7 weeks, or 49 years (ver. 25), and the second of 62 weeks, or 434 years (verses 25, 26). Hence the phrase

"*after the threescore and two weeks*" refers to the conclusion of the second period, which ends the 69 weeks, or 483 years from the date at which the prophecy begins. Consequently, Aquila and Symmachus (see *Crit. Comm.*) have not altered the sense of the original by their reintroduction of the "seven" before the sixty-two, reading "*and after the weeks, the seven and the sixty-two.*"

The expression "*shall be cut off*" is frequently used of death by execution or violence, although the phrase says nothing about the kind of death. The expression is employed of any means, natural, accidental, or judicial, by which the ungodly may be "rooted out" (Ps. xxxvii. 9, 22; Prov. ii. 22), whether by death (Gen. ix. 11; Zech. xiii. 8) or other "cutting off" (Exod. xii. 15, 19; Lev. vii. 20, 21, xxii. 3; Ps. ci. 8; Ezra vii. 26, x. 18). It is sometimes used of the cutting down of trees. There is a significant passage in Jer. xi. 19, where those that devised devices against Jeremiah are represented as saying, "Let us destroy the tree with its fruit, and let us cut him off from the land of the living." Parallel is the expression used of Messiah in Isa. liii. 8, where it is said, "*He was cut off from the land of the living.*"

Modern critical expositors have explained the statement in Daniel to indicate either (1) the assassination of Seleucus Philopator (B.C. 175), who was the predecessor of Antiochus Epiphanes; or (2) the deposition of Onias III. from the high priesthood in the early part of Antiochus Epiphanes' reign; or (3) the murder of that high priest some years later. But the prophecy, when viewed in connection with its context, cannot be fairly expounded in any of those three senses.

The phrase "*and he shall have nothing*" is so indefinite that it has given rise to a number of expositions, as well

as to conjectural emendations. The emendations have generally arisen from dogmatic bias. There is no lack of partial parallels.¹ In all those noted in the *Critical Commentary* the subject is supplied. The nearest parallel to the passage before us is Exod. xxii. 2 (E.V. ver. 3), where it is said of the thief, "*He shall surely make restitution; if he has nothing* (לֹא יֵרָאֵן דָּנָן), *then he shall be sold for his theft.*" So here, "*Messiah shall be cut off and have nothing.*" The translation of the A.V., "*but not for himself,*" is incorrect (see *Crit. Comm.*).

On the whole, it is best to render, "*and there shall be nothing to him,*" or "*he shall have nothing.*" It was left to the future to reveal the real meaning of the phrase. If the passage be Messianic, it is best explained in the language of St John i. 10: "*He came unto his own things* (εἰς τὰ ἴδια, i.e. land, city, temple), *and they that were his own* (οἱ ἴδιοι, the nation of Israel) *received him not.*"

Jerome, who understood the passage of Christ, explains the phrase, "*and it (the Jewish nation) will not be His people,*" paraphrasing the whole: "*et non erit ejus populus qui eum negaturus est.*" If the passage were expounded on such lines, it would be more correct to make the city, mentioned in the previous part of the prophecy, the subject of the clause, which city ceased to be the city of God by its rejection of Messiah. The clause cannot with any propriety be explained to signify that Jason or Menelaus (who were successively high priests after Onias III.) as apostates could not be legitimate successors to Onias. Nor can the passage refer to Onias himself, for his son fled to Egypt, and became the founder and high priest of the schismatical Onias-temple erected in Helio-

¹ See *Crit. Comm.*

polis in defiance of the Mosaic law, although in pretended fulfilment of a prophecy of Isaiah (ch. xix. 19).

Moreover, as Köhler (*Lehrb. d. bibl. Gesch.*) well observes, it would be strange to speak of Onias III. who had been deposed some years before as Messiah. The destruction, too, of the city and temple was not the result of the death of Onias, which the text would lead us to infer was to be the consequence of the cutting off of Messiah.

Professor Bevan remarks that "the latter end of ver. 26 and the whole of ver. 27 are involved in such extraordinary difficulties that hardly any two interpreters take the same view." Hence, he observes, "any attempt to construe or emend the passage must be regarded as purely conjectural." This is a candid admission from a scholar who regards the whole prophecy as having been composed in Maccabean times, and with special reference to the events of that period. It is hard to imagine how a pretended prophecy could have appeared at such a period, setting forth in concocted prophetic language the main events of that time, and yet that able critics should find it impossible to arrive at any conclusion as to the meaning of its clauses. That, however, is the conclusion which Professor Bevan has arrived at. After almost every sentence in the prophecy has been made the sport of criticism, twisted in all directions, corrected and amended by each subsequent critic, it is at last pronounced unintelligible! But the prophecy is one whose text has been handed down with tolerable correctness by those opposed to the Christian interpretation, and which, as shall be later pointed out, has not been left uninterpreted by our Lord.

Kamphausen, in his critical edition of Daniel, published in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, remarks :

“By the use of indefinite and obscure expressions the author has succeeded in preventing certain passages in verses 24-27 from being ever understood with any certainty. But the more the difficulties in understanding an important passage of the Book of Daniel, the less we are permitted to make an attempt at overcoming them by mere alteration of the text. In such cases the text has probably been transmitted with especial care.”

These observations are just. Modern critics have, to a large extent, been led astray by a predetermination to treat the passage as one which expresses the views of an author of the Maccabean period on that great struggle. They have sought in every way to modify the text to make it coincide with their preconceived ideas, and to give the *coup de grace* to the Messianic interpretation.

There is no substantial difference between scholars as to the translation of the concluding clauses of ver. 26 : “*and the holy city the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy, and its end¹ shall be in the flood, and unto an end of war² desolations are determined.*”³

¹ That is, the end of the city ; or “his end,” *i.e.* the end of the prince whose coming is spoken of.

² So the Massorettes punctuate the words, or, as the R.V. has it, “*and unto the end shall be war*”—which would require a slight disjunctive accent on וְ.

³ Professor Bevan, “though with the greatest diffidence,” rewrites the whole passage : “and the city and the sanctuary itself shall go to ruin together with the prince that shall come (after Onias).” It may perhaps be possible for this clause to speak of matters supposed to happen after the conclusion of the seventy weeks, provided such events be described as the results of other events predicted as taking place within that period. It may not, therefore, be absolutely conclusive against Professor Bevan’s view that Jason, whom that scholar regards as the prince to follow Onias III., perished about B.C. 170. But it is almost impossible to regard וְ to mean to *follow after*, or to *succeed to office*.

Ver. 27 concludes the prophecy. It consists of four sentences, and in every one of those sentences modern critics have proposed alterations. All those emendations are based upon pure fancy. They show, however, that the later critics no longer believe the interpretation which the earlier scholars of their school put upon this portion of Daniel, namely, that it was only an echo of 1 Macc. i. 11-13. Had that been true, the LXX. would certainly have incorporated the idea into their paraphrase. Dean Farrar and Meinhold still adhere to that interpretation, although it has been rejected by the ablest scholars of the advanced school. This remarkable variety of opinion among expositors is not due to any ambiguity in the original itself, but arises from the predetermination to force the passage into harmony with the events of the Maccabean period.

The second clause of the verse harmonises with the Maccabean hypothesis, and is, perhaps, the most difficult to explain on the lines of the Messianic interpretation. We shall comment on it presently (pp. 236-7).

The third clause, which is literally, "*and upon a wing of abominations (shall come) one who maketh desolate,*" has, on account of its peculiar phraseology, given rise to a large number of interpretations, partly founded upon the Massoretic text, and partly on emendations of the same. It is strange that the more doubtful any critical point is, the more bold are the assertions made with regard to it. Behrmann correctly regards the phrase as a poetical expression, "*upon the wing of abominations comes the Desolator.*" Desolation is personified as an avenging power borne along and conveyed upon the wing of abominations. Even as Jehovah is said to hasten, riding upon a cherub, when descending for the salvation or

rescue of His people,—“and he rode upon a cherub and did fly: yea, he flew swiftly upon the wings of the wind” (Ps. xviii. 10),—so the Desolator is represented as borne aloft upon the wing of the abominations committed. In other words, the abominations committed in the Temple and in the holy city were the cause of the desolations threatened by the prophets of old.

For full criticisms on the details of the several verses, reference must be made to the *Critical Commentary*, but it may be useful here to give a general sketch of the prophecy as a whole.

Ver. 24 announces the work which was to be accomplished during the limits of the Seventy Weeks. The announcement made by the angel was the answer to Daniel's prayer for pardon and forgiveness of himself and his nation.

The Divine answer spoke of mercy, not of wrath. It did not announce that the “seventy years” of captivity predicted by Jeremiah were so far from exhausting the times appointed for Israel's punishment (as Isaiah had affirmed, ch. xl. 2), that the full punishment of the people for the sins of their forefathers would not be exhausted until “seventy times seven.” That exposition is a miserable “after-thought” concocted by the critical school of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The prophecy announces that, notwithstanding Israel's sins in the past, and her defilements in the time then present, Jehovah would still continue to preserve that nation as His people and Jerusalem as the holy city for a period of almost five centuries.

The oracle, moreover, announced that the longed-for Messianic age would arrive before those seventy weeks had run their course. Taking up the parable of the old

prophets of Israel, it predicted that within that period transgression would be put an end to, by sin being graciously pardoned, and, as the necessary consequence, sin-offerings would cease, for "in those sacrifices there is a remembrance made of sins year by year" (Heb. x. 3). "Atonement was to be made for iniquity."

Those acts of mercy, of which Jehovah alike was the promiser and the performer, were to be succeeded by further gifts of grace. Everlasting righteousness was to be brought in; vision and prophet were to be sealed. All the revelations of Messianic days which the prophets "saw" in vision would be accomplished, and the Divine seal thus impressed upon the mission of the prophets. A true "holy of holies" would be anointed, and a real sanctuary consecrated, of which the language of the Apocalypse might well be used: "The temple of God was opened in heaven" (Rev. xi. 19).

The period from which those five centuries were to start is set forth enigmatically in ver. 25. The prophecy was to begin "*from the going forth of a commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem.*" This cannot be a Divine command, which, as some moderns maintain, the writer imagined had "gone forth" before the walls of Jerusalem had been destroyed by the Babylonian conqueror. The prophet conceived an edict "going forth" from the world-power which held Israel in subjection. Four such decrees were issued. The first was that of Cyrus (B.C. 536), which was not confined to the rebuilding of the Temple, as some have imagined (2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23; Ezra i. 1-4). Cyrus' decree, as Isaiah describes it (ch. xliv. 26-28, xliv. 13), was for the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the raising up of the wastes of Judah. Cyrus did not dream of rebuilding a temple in the midst of a city which

was to remain in "ruinous heaps," although the fortifications of the city were not specially mentioned in his edict. The building of the new temple began the year after Cyrus' decree. Zerubbabel, prince of the house of David, was then governor of the land; and his colleague in the work of rebuilding was Joshua, the high priest. 42,360 Jews and Israelites returned under the leadership of Zerubbabel to the Holy Land, the altar of Jehovah was erected, sacrifices were offered upon that altar, and the foundations of the Temple itself were duly laid (Ezra iii.). The work of its re-erection, obstructed by the Samaritans, was carried on in a half-hearted manner for some twelve years, and finally put a stop to by the command of the Pseudo-Smerdis (B.C. 522). Under the stirring exhortations of Haggai and Zechariah, work was resumed upon the building in the second year of Darius Hystaspes, and in the year following (B.C. 518) that monarch issued an edict commanding that the work should be prosecuted "with speed" (Ezra vi. 1-12). That latter decree, however, was simply a repetition of that of Cyrus, and only mentioned the rebuilding of the Temple.

The third decree was issued in the seventh year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (B.C. 457), and is given in Ezra vii. Its importance lies in the fact that Ezra received the royal permission not only to rebuild the Temple, but to re-impose upon the people the Levitical law, and to appoint magistrates to judge offenders, with authority to punish evil-doers with fines and imprisonment, by banishment or death. On account of Ezra's investment with such quasi-regal authority, and the restoration he effected of the Jewish state and religion, and the care afterwards bestowed upon the sacred books of the nation, Ezra has ever been viewed as a second Moses.

The fourth decree was connected with the commission granted to Nehemiah to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. That final decree went forth in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus (B.C. 444). A royal edict was probably issued, though not actually mentioned. The Book of Nehemiah speaks only of a verbal permission granted to Nehemiah to see that the former edicts were carried into effect. To accredit Nehemiah, however, in that work, royal letters were granted to "the governors beyond the river" Euphrates (Neh. ii. 7-9). Nehemiah himself was made "governor in the land of Judah" (Neh. v. 15), and granted a military escort (Neh. ii. 9) to Jerusalem. Zerubbabel had long before passed off the scene.

The terminus to which the Seventy Weeks extend is distinctly stated in ver. 25 to be "*to Messiah, a prince.*" There is no difficulty in regarding the word as a proper name. The Massoretic punctuation presents no serious obstacle (see remarks on pp. 206 ff.). There is no occasion to assert with Pusey that that punctuation was "done dishonestly." It is probably only one of many instances of emphatic accentuation (see p. 207). And, even if the accentuation of that clause presented some difficulty, the accentuation itself is not of prime importance.

The Seventy Weeks were the times allotted to the Jewish people and the holy city. The prophet was informed that at, or shortly after, the close of that period the nation would no longer continue to be the peculiar people of God, and the holy city would be once more reduced to desolation on account of renewed transgression. Earlier prophets cast light on the language of Daniel. Hosea predicts the casting away of Israel by representing it as called by the name of Lo-ammi, "Not-my-people." When Hosea predicts its restoration again the nation

receives the appellation of Ammi, "My people" (Hos. i. 9, 11). Jeremiah predicts the recovery of the nation as a rebuilding of the city of God: "Again I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel" (Jer. xxxi. 4); "I will build thee again as at the first" (Jer. xxxiii. 7). Amos uses the same language: "I will raise up its ruins as in the days of old" (Amos ix. 11). And Isaiah: "They shall call thee the city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel" (Isa. lx. 10-18). Isaiah finally speaks of the walls and gates of that living Jerusalem, and describes it and them in the most glowing of his prophetic descriptions (Isa. liv. 11, 12).

During the first "seven weeks," or first half-century, the Temple was rebuilt and readorned, the Levitical worship restored to its ancient form, the Levitical law reinstated as the law of the nation, the city rebuilt with streets, open places, and fortifications, the holy writings rescued from oblivion, re-edited, and again committed to the guardianship of the people. The last acts of reform whereby the Levitical system was restored, and Jerusalem surrounded by its walls was re-established as the holy city, are mentioned in Nehemiah. By those acts the foreign idolatrous wives were put away alike by people and priests, and the Sabbath once more became the outward sign of the Covenant (Neh. xiii.). The exact date at which those events took place cannot, it is true, be assigned, but they must have taken place some time earlier than fifty years after the edict in the seventh year of Artaxerxes. All those reforms were carried out "in troublous days."

The "sixty and two weeks," or 434 years, which comprise the second period, were, comparatively speaking, as Zechariah had predicted, times of quiet for the nation.

Despite the loss of national independence, Jerusalem never experienced greater prosperity for so long a period than fell to her lot in those four and a half centuries. The time from the rebuilding of the Temple by Solomon in B.C. 975 up to its destruction by Nebuchadnezzar in B.C. 587 was somewhat less than four centuries. During that period Jerusalem was several times besieged and taken, her streets were reddened with blood, and her Temple defiled by idolatrous rites. The troubles in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes were severe; but the sorrows of Jerusalem at that period (which were brought about by the sin of her own people) were not as great as those experienced in the days of Manasseh, although Judah was for the most part of that king's reign an independent kingdom, and the monarch himself was a scion of the house of David.

So far, therefore, as the first two periods are concerned, the answer to the prayer of Daniel was an answer of peace. But the morning of hope and the day of prosperity were to be closed by a night of gloom. The closing week, or the last seven years of Israel's existence as "the holy nation," and of Jerusalem as "the holy city," like the period depicted in Zechariah, was a period not dark and not light. There was, indeed, great light, for the Light had come and the glory of the Lord had arisen; but there was also darkness, for He came unto His own to receive the fruit of the vineyard He had planted, and He received it not.¹

The events predicted in verses 26 and 27 lie *partly within and partly outside* the limits of the Seventy Weeks. Those verses distinctly speak of certain events which were to take place within the last week. But at their

¹ See *Bampton Lectures on Zechariah*, pp. 485 ff.

close events are predicted which were to occur after "the seventy weeks" had run their course, for the prophecy runs on to the end of the world.

The sixty-ninth week of this great period was to terminate at the opening of the Messianic days, at the advent of "Messiah, a prince." The days of Messiah, which followed those of the Law and the Prophets, began (according to our Lord's own declaration) with the preaching of John the Baptist. "The law and the prophets are until John: since that time the gospel of the kingdom of God is preached, and every man entereth violently into it" (Luke xvi. 16, R.V.). The sixty-ninth week, therefore, terminated at A.D. 26, when John the Baptist began to preach in the wilderness of Judæa—483 years after the decree of Artaxerxes which directed the re-establishment of the Levitical law in all its vigour throughout the Holy Land.

During the last week of the great period of the Seventy—that is, during the seven years which intervened between the commencement of John's preaching and the crucifixion of our Lord—Messiah "*made firm a covenant with the many.*"¹ A revival of religion took place. The Baptist, as well as the Christ, entered into covenant alike

¹ See *Critical Commentary* on ver. 27. Driver's assertion (*Introduction*, p. 495) that Christ did not "confirm a covenant with many for one week," because His ministry lasted at most over three years, leaves completely out of sight the fact that the early years of the Christian Church were the most successful in winning the adhesion of Jews. Exact dates cannot be assigned, as they are not given in the Acts of the Apostles. But the period after Pentecost was rich in blessings, especially to Israel. It is not, therefore, so "arbitrary" to explain the seven years as embracing partly the years of Christ's ministry and partly the times which immediately succeeded. Our interpretation, which entirely avoids this difficulty, is given above.

with all classes of society, nobles and beggars, Levites, priests and people. To all was preached the glad news of the kingdom of God. The nation as a nation was still under the bonds of the Covenant. It was still the people of Jehovah. Jerusalem was the holy city, its temple still the house of the Father. The Baptist and the Christ were messengers from Jehovah to the whole of Israel.

But amid the brightness of that period there were signs of a coming crisis. Dark symptoms of "a falling away" appeared amid the display of outward religious zeal. At the close of the prosperous days of king Uzziah, the prophet Isaiah "saw" in vision the tokens of the spiritual leprosy of the nation, extending "from the sole of the foot even unto the head." Amid the preaching of good tidings the Baptist announced that "the axe was laid to the root of the trees," and Christ Himself predicted the day when Jerusalem should be trodden down of the Gentiles (Luke xxi. 24). Jesus declared that He had not come to bring peace, but a sword (Matt. x. 34). The Good Shepherd had before that time broken the staff of "beauty" with which He had led forth His people as a flock to the pastures. He was now to cut asunder the staff of "bands," and to break up the unity of the nation. For His demand for "wages" was scornfully rejected, and He was valued at "thirty pieces of silver."¹ After the end of the second period—the sixty and two weeks, or 434 years, during which the Levitical law, with its external glories, had been permitted to endure—Messiah was cut off, and Temple, city, and people became no longer His own. Israel will not again be His people until the day arrives to which He pointed, as He quitted for the last time the courts of the Temple, in those

¹ See *Bampton Lectures on Zechariah*, pp. 340 ff.

prophetic words : "Ye shall not see me henceforth till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord" (Matt. xxiii. 39). The fateful 490 years expired about A.D. 33, when the Lord was crucified, and when the nation and church of Israel rejected their Prince and Messiah as an impostor and blasphemer.

If the clause had the preposition and article, "*and in the midst of the week*" (as the A.V. has translated it, following Theodotion, ἐν τῷ ἡμισυ τῆς ἐβδομάδος), there would be no difficulty in explaining the clause to mean that the crucifixion of Christ was the death-knell of the Levitical sacrifices and oblations. The alteration necessary to be made in the text is small, and the authority of Theodotion's version, and even of the LXX., ἐν τῷ τέλει τῆς ἐβδομάδος, might be adduced in support of such a reading.¹ But, inasmuch as we have had to protest against corrections of the text made in the interests of the application of the prophecy to the events of the Maccabean era, we cannot venture to make any correction for the purpose of strengthening the Messianic interpretation. It must, then, not be explained to mean "in the *middle* of the week," although the Hebrew might bear that signification. The natural interpretation of the clause as it stands would be to regard the phrase as an accusative of time, "*for half the week*" (as rendered in the R.V.), or "*during half the week.*" The clause is, in fact, the only one in the prophecy which lends itself to any extent to the Maccabean interpretation. It does not, however, by any means accurately coincide with the facts of the Maccabean period, for sacrifice and oblation ceased in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes for barely three years, not for three and a half years. Moreover, an accusative of time does

¹ See *Critical Commentary*.

not always indicate *duration*, but frequently supplies the answer to the question, *When?* Hence the clause may be interpreted to mean "*in the half of the week,*" which, according to our interpretation, was the period of our Lord's ministry on earth. During that half week, during its course, He would cause sacrifice and oblation to cease. The clause goes back to the subject touched upon in the opening verse of the prophecy, in which it was stated that during the Seventy Weeks "sin-offerings" were to come to an end. The supplementary statement in ver. 27 goes, however, further than that in ver. 24. It announces that not only the offerings for sin, but all kinds of "sacrifice" whatever, even the accompanying minchah, or *offering*, were to be brought to an end in the course of the half week which would complete the great period.

We lay no stress upon minute fulfilments, nor do we consider it important to discuss minute points of chronology. Although our interpretation is distinctly on the lines of the so-called traditional or Church interpretation of this great prophecy, attention has frequently been called to its indefinite character. The *terminus a quo* could not have been ascertained with anything like certainty until the great period had fully come to an end. Even then there was much to hinder those who did not choose to understand from seeing the *terminus ad quem* to which it pointed, although the great events predicted had actually passed before their view. The close of the first period of 49 years, the close of the second period of 434 years, and the last seven years, both commencement and termination—the greatest period that earth has yet seen—were all veiled from unwilling eyes. The English futurist expositors of our day, highly

dogmatic as is their tone (Mr Pember and Sir R. Anderson), have failed to demonstrate the preciseness of the chronology, and, like the "higher critics" whom they detest, are intensely dogmatic on points on which the evidence adduced is most uncertain.¹

All that indefiniteness and uncertainty as to precise dates is, however, exactly in accordance with the analogy of prophecy. Round numbers may be used; the commencement and the end of periods may not be strictly defined. No writing is in existence which gives the history of Jerusalem between Nehemiah and Alexander the Great. We cannot positively tell when all things were put in order. But there are none of those large discrepancies as to numbers and times which, as already seen, exist on the Maccabean hypothesis. No "stumbling-block" is cast up in the way of the believer. The mistakes of Christian

¹ *The Great Prophecies of the Centuries concerning Israel and the Gentiles*, by G. H. Pember (London, 1902); *The Coming Prince, or the Seventy Weeks of Daniel, with an Answer to the Higher Criticism*, by Sir Robert Anderson, LL.D. (1895); *Daniel in the Critics' Den: A Reply to Dean Farrar's "Book of Daniel,"* by Sir Robert Anderson, LL.D. (Edinburgh and London, Blackwood & Sons, 1895). The last-named work contains some smart criticism, but breaks down completely when it comes to interpretation. Mr Pember's book is, we consider, thoroughly unscientific, even from an "orthodox" point of view. It is strangely fanciful and wild in its ideas respecting a reign of Satan, and lays undue stress upon the scandalous aberrations of the Paris "Luciferians." Disgusting and blasphemous things of that nature have ever at intervals existed throughout the centuries, and will continue to exist to the time of the end. But to propound the theory that Satan in person will be actually worshipped by the world at large, and that society will sink into utter chaos before the Second Advent, is, we maintain, opposed to all Scripture. These ultra-literalists are doing as much damage to God's Word as the critics whom they regard as the precursors of Antichrist.

expositors may be traced up to the false schools of exegesis in which they were trained, and have been mainly due to their desire to predict a future quite outside the horizon of the prophecy. There is not a line in the prophecy concerning "the Antichrist" of whom the Fathers wrote so fantastically.

Josephus refers to this prophecy in his history of the last days of Jerusalem, when he states: "Now what did most elevate them (the Jews) in undertaking this war was '*an ambiguous oracle,*' that was also found in their sacred writings, how, about this time, one from this country should become governor of the habitable earth." Josephus, to flatter the Roman Emperor, gives his explanation: "Now this oracle certainly denoted the government of Vespasian, who was appointed emperor in Judæa" (*De Bello Jud.* lib. vi. c. v., 4).

The closing part of the prophecy easily falls in with Josephus' exegesis. For, according to the Talmudic story, when Ben Zakkai escaped "with the skin of his teeth" from the city of Jerusalem, and reached the camp of Titus, he saluted the Roman general as king, and when informed that he was not a king, replied, quoting the substance of this Danielic prophecy: "True, thou art not yet a king: but a monarch shalt thou become, for the Temple of Jerusalem can only perish by the hands of a king."

The prophecy affirms that "*the people of the prince that shall come,*" i.e. the armies of that world-power announced in earlier predictions, "*shall destroy the city and the sanctuary, and its end shall be in the flood,*" which flood was only to be the commencement of those many wars in which "nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom." "*Upon the wing of abominations*" committed

in the city and the sanctuary the devastating eagles of the Roman army were borne along in their all-victorious flight. But it was no less true in the case of the Romans, as in the earlier instance of the Assyrians, that when the Lord had performed His whole work upon Mount Zion and on Jerusalem, He would punish the oppressor, "for a consummation, and that determined, shall the Lord Jehovah of hosts make in the midst of all the earth" (Isa. xxviii. 22).¹

The judgment to be poured upon the city and the sanctuary lay outside the limits of the "Seventy Weeks," and so does the judgment destined to be poured upon the oppressor at a later period of the world's history.

Our Lord's discourse on the Mount of Olives, in which He gives a description of the Messianic age up to the time of the Second Advent, contains a quotation from the LXX. translation of Daniel. The passage of "Daniel the prophet" which speaks of "*the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place*" was no doubt understood by the LXX. translators of the idol or idol's altar erected in the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes. The passage was also thus understood by the writer of 1 Maccabees, writing some years later with the LXX. translation before him. That interpretation our Lord cast aside, while He spoke of the prophecy having reference to the events preceding the siege of Jerusalem (Matt. xxiv. 15). The exact interpretation of some of our Lord's words may be uncertain. But assuming, as is true in numerous instances in the New Testament in which quotations are made from the LXX. version, that what we have to look for is not verbal but substantial agreement, our Lord must have applied the prophecy to the events of which we have expounded it.

¹ See *Critical Commentary* on ver. 27.

Christ directed those who heard His words to note that the abominations committed in the city and the sanctuary were the cause of the coming desolation, and that therefore they that were wise ought to flee then out of Jerusalem (as their forefathers were commanded by Jeremiah to flee out of Babylon)—“My people, go ye out of the midst of her, and save yourselves every man from the fierce anger of the Lord” (Jer. li. 45).

CHAPTER VIII

THE LAST VISION OF DANIEL (CH. XI., XII.)—PERSIA AND GREECE—WARS BETWEEN SYRIA AND EGYPT—ANTIOCHUS THE GREAT AND HIS OVERTHROW—SELEUCUS IV.

THE eleventh chapter has long been considered the great difficulty of the Book of Daniel. The minute chronicle of the events connected with the kingdom of Alexander the Great and his successors, the detailed account of the wars between the kings of Syria and Egypt almost to the end of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, with the minute acquaintance with the details of the latter king's career up to December 165 B.C., have all been cited as proofs that the book must have been composed almost within a month or two after the latter date, that is, about January or February 164 B.C.

The probability is that the eleventh chapter is a Hebrew translation of a lost Aramaic original, combined with an exposition of the prophecy, which itself is not extant as a whole, but of which portions, as in the Targums of a later age, are embedded in the chapter. The causes which led to this part of the work being translated into Hebrew, and thus paraphrased, will be seen in the course of the discussion.

In the first verse of the chapter an important variant occurs in the Septuagint version. The Hebrew Mas-

soretic text in its present shape is fairly represented in the Revised Version: "*And as for me, in the first year of Darius the Mede I stood up to confirm and strengthen him.*"¹ Ancient versions exhibit a great variety of reading. The LXX. text ignores "and as for me," reading simply, "in the first year of Cyrus the king," which reading is endorsed by the judgment of many critics. From an exegetical point of view, "the first year of Cyrus the king" is a far more probable date than "the first year of Darius the Mede." Viewed from the prophetic standpoint, the latter year was devoid of significance, unless that year itself be identical with the first year of Cyrus (see ch. iv.). The first year of Cyrus was the year in which the proclamation was issued which gave the Israelites permission to return to their country, from which they had been carried away captive in the days of Nebuchadnezzar.

If the phenomena presented in Daniel xi. are to be fairly considered, they must in the outset be viewed apart from all critical conjectures. The greater portion of those conjectures have been made with the object either of harmonising the Hebrew and the LXX., or with the view of modifying the statements of the chapter so as to make it harmonise with the supposed facts of history.

It is, however, also necessary to avoid the mistakes of Kranichfeld, who, in his suggestive work, *Das Buch Daniel erklärt* (Berlin, 1868), has laid himself open to Behrmann's retort of being more disposed to accept *vaticinia sine eventu* than *vaticinia post eventum*.

The rugged character of the LXX. translation in the chapter is patent. Robertson Smith suggests that the opening words of the verse are a fragment of a heading incorrectly introduced into this place. That solution is

¹ See *Critical Commentary*.

possible. But it is wiser to leave the text as it is, marking the passage, however, as corrupt.

The prophecy commences at verse 2. The R.V. translates: "*And now I will shew thee the truth. Behold there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all: and when he is waxed strong through his riches, he shall stir up all against the realm of Greece.*"

Only *four* Persian kings are here mentioned, although in the period which intervened from Cyrus to Darius Codomanus there were no less than thirteen Persian monarchs. *Nine* of those monarchs are, therefore, passed over in silence. It is not, however, true that only *four* Persian kings are mentioned in the Old Testament. Six are distinctly alluded to.

Cyrus is often referred to. *Cambyses*, his son and successor, is mentioned in Ezra iv. 6 under the name of *Ahasuerus*. The Pseudo-Smerdis (the *Gonates* of the Behistun inscription), who usurped the throne on the death of Cambyses, is mentioned in Ezra iv. 7, under the name of *Artaxerxes*. His reign, in Jewish annals, was remarkable as being that in which the rebuilding of the Temple, permitted by Cyrus, was put a stop to. The next Persian monarch in order was *Darius Hystaspes*, who is also spoken of by Ezra (iv. 24) as the monarch in whose reign and with whose permission the building of the Temple was completed. The successor of Darius Hystaspes was *Xerxes*, mentioned in ch. xi. 1, and known as the *Ahasuerus* of the Book of Esther. This makes no less than *five*, to which must be added a *sixth*, viz. *Artaxerxes Longimanus*, the Artaxerxes spoken of in the Book of Nehemiah, during whose reign Ezra carried out important reforms.

Hence it is better to explain Daniel's statement on the supposition that, in the opinion of the Jews, Cambyses, who succeeded to the throne of Medo-Persia after the death of Cyrus, and the Pseudo-Smerdis were viewed as one and the same monarch. Cambyses took but little interest in Jewish affairs. The accusation of the Samaritans against the Jews was sent in at the close of his reign. The order to stop the building of the Temple was forwarded during the short-lived usurpation of the Pseudo-Smerdis, although decided on in the reign of Cambyses. Up to the accession of Xerxes there were but three Persian kings who had given themselves any concern about Israel.

Xerxes is the fourth Persian king spoken of in ver. 2. The allusion to Javan or Greece as a "*kingdom*" is, as Kranichfeld observes, quite in harmony with the standpoint of the seer, which was about sixty years before Xerxes. Hitzig maintains Greece is inaccurately described as a "*kingdom.*" The description, however, fully accords with the manner in which Greece is regarded in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar (Dan. ii.), and in Daniel's vision recorded in ch. vii.

The reference to the monarchs of Persia closes with the mention of Xerxes' expedition against Greece. Good reasons may be assigned for that fact being brought into connection with the history of Alexander the Great's expedition against Persia, although Xerxes' expedition occurred in B.C. 480, and Alexander's campaign against Persia took place nearly a century and a half later, in B.C. 334. In writing to Darius, Alexander stated that his expedition against Asia was undertaken to avenge the former Persian invasions of Greece.

Alexander the Great is brought upon the scene in

verse 3: "*And a mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will.*"

The prophecy proceeds to state: "*And while he (Alexander) is standing up, his kingdom shall be broken.*" Alterations of the text have been proposed by critics in order to give the passage the greater appearance of being a *vaticinium post eventum*. The expression cannot, with Hävernicks, be explained, "*when he shall have reached the zenith of his power,*" but it may easily be interpreted after the analogy of Zech. xiv. 12, where that prophet speaks of the flesh of the enemies of the Lord consuming away while they are standing upon their feet. The mighty king is represented as having his kingdom shivered into pieces while he was in the act of standing up. Alexander's reign, brilliant though it was, lasted but for a moment. He ascended the throne B.C. 336, and died in 323.

"*And (his kingdom) shall be divided to the four winds of heaven; but not to his posterity.*" The Hebrew phraseology is essentially in accordance with the style of the prophets, although not found elsewhere in Daniel.¹

The Hebrew text in the second part of the verse is hardly intelligible. To whom does the demonstrative pronoun refer? Not to the *posterity* of Alexander previously mentioned, for the word "*besides*" is used in the sense of "*in addition to,*" "*except.*" If used in reference to Alexander's posterity, the sentence would mean that they, along with certain *others*, would share his kingdom. That meaning, however, is excluded by the preceding verse. The phrase can scarcely mean the

¹ See *Critical Commentary*. The R.V. renders the second part of the verse: "*But not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion wherewith he ruled; for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others besides these.*"

kingdom "shall belong to others (Alexander's generals) besides these (same generals)." The passage has, therefore, then to be explained, "*the kingdom shall be to others* ("others" not specially defined) *in addition to these,*" i.e. in addition to Alexander's first successors or generals. Those successors of Alexander were evidently in the writer's mind, though not previously mentioned. This interpretation is substantially that of Jerome, and is generally adopted by the modern critics. But it can hardly be deemed satisfactory. The Hebrew text, therefore, being confused, the ancient versions were naturally "at sea" as to its signification. The confusion may be an indication that the chapter, to a considerable extent, is an expanded text interwoven with notes which give outlines of interpretation. These interpolations are not dissimilar in character to the notes introduced in later days into the Syriac Peshitto version of the chapter (see *Critical Commentary*).

The prophecy from ver. 5 onward relates the histories of the kingdoms of Egypt (the south) and Syria (the north), those being the kingdoms which came into contact with the people of Israel and the land of Palestine.

Ver. 5 has been variously rendered:—(I.) "*And the king of the south shall be strong, and be one of his princes.*" That is, Ptolemy I. Soter, king of Egypt, shall be strong, and be one of Alexander the Great's princes. Such is the Massoretic punctuation. If correct, the clause that follows must also refer to Ptolemy, because no new subject is introduced into the Hebrew text. Hence that clause, in connection with the former, must be rendered, "*and shall be stronger than he, and rule. His dominion shall be a mighty dominion.*" The statement, if restricted to Ptolemy's rule over Egypt, may be defended. Egypt

was more fully subdued by Ptolemy than it ever was by Alexander. It is, however, arbitrary to explain the passage exclusively of Egypt. And forasmuch as the empire of the Ptolemies never equalled that of Alexander, the Massoretic punctuation has been generally regarded as erroneous.¹

(II.) Assuming the Massoretic punctuation to be incorrect, Hitzig, with many moderns, renders the verse: "*And the king of the south shall be strong; and one of his princes shall become stronger than he, and shall rule; a great dominion shall be his dominion.*" The meaning then would be: "*And the king of the south (Ptolemy, king of Egypt) shall be strong; and one of his (Ptolemy's) princes shall be stronger than he, and rule; his dominion shall be a great dominion.*" The second clause in that case would refer to Seleucus,² who, though one of Alexander's generals,

¹ According to the interpretation interwoven with the Syriac version, Ptolemy, king of Egypt, is rightly explained to be the king of the south; the pronoun in the phrase "*and one of his princes*" being correctly referred to Alexander the Great. The references in the after part of the verse are referred to Antiochus Theos, the kingdom of Asia being that of Syria. Antiochus II. Theos, son of Antiochus Soter, and grandson of Seleucus Nicator, ascended the throne of Syria in 261. The interpretation will, however, not bear investigation, though it was adopted by many of the older commentators.

² Mr Edward R. Bevan, brother of Professor Bevan of Cambridge, in his remarkable work, *The House of Seleucus* (2 vols., London: Ed. Arnold, 1902), takes this view of the passage, remarking: "Seleucus was merely a subordinate, 'one of the captains' of Ptolemy, as the Book of Daniel describes him." The rendering alluded to is given in the margin of the R.V. But it is not in accordance with the Massoretic punctuation, which cuts off the "*and one of his princes*" from the words following. The rendering is moreover opposed by the copula in "*and shall be stronger than he.*" Hitzig's translation of the copula as "*so*" is also very questionable.

and one who had obtained an independent satrapy—that of Babylonia,—was, owing to the ambition of Antigonus, compelled to flee to Egypt to Ptolemy in B.C. 316, and served as a general under Ptolemy until B.C. 312, when he re-entered Babylon as conqueror. The Syrian monarchy is dated from that year, although Seleucus did not actually assume the royal title till B.C. 306. In that year also Ptolemy took the title of king.

It is strange that no reference is made in this historical sketch to the onslaught which Ptolemy Soter made on Jerusalem in B.C. 320, when (as related by Josephus, *Antiq.* xii. 1) Jerusalem was captured on the Sabbath day. On his return to Egypt, Ptolemy brought back a large number of Jews and Samaritans, who settled in that country. Palestine for a time fell under the dominion of Antigonus, until it was wrested from him by Seleucus, in the capacity of commander-in-chief of the Egyptian forces.

The reign of Seleucus' son, Antiochus I. Soter, is in this chapter passed over in silence, because Antiochus was not brought into any serious contact with the Jewish people. Great events, which led on to still greater results, took place during the sixteen years of Antiochus' reign. Those events, however, were passed over because they did not directly concern the people of Israel. For that reason the Book of Daniel omits all reference to the important events which took place in Greece after Seleucus' death.

The wars between Syria and Egypt from this date were incessant, and the Jews, crushed between those mill-stones, suffered severely. Hence the interest taken by the Jews in some parts of the history. There is a large gap in the chronicle. The origin, or, at least, one of

the causes, which led to the bloody struggle is recorded in ver. 6. No allusion is made to the impious assumption of the name of *God* by Antiochus II. Theos. The object of the paraphrast was evidently not to give a complete history of the times.

“And at the end of years they (the kings of Egypt and Syria) shall make an alliance together; and a daughter of the king of the south shall come to the king of the north in order to make an agreement; but she shall not retain the strength of arm; and he shall not stand, nor his arm; and she shall be given up, she and they who brought her, and he that strengthened her at those times” (ver. 6).

The facts alluded to are the following:—In order to make an alliance with the great northern kingdom, Ptolemy Philadelphus (son and successor of Ptolemy I. Soter), at the close of his reign, B.C. 248, hoping to make a lasting peace between Egypt and Syria, gave his daughter Berenice in marriage to Antiochus Theos, and provided her with a rich dowry. The conditions of the marriage were that Antiochus should divorce his wife Laodice,¹ declare her offspring illegitimate, and secure to the offspring of Berenice the succession to the throne of Syria. The arrangement was but short-lived, and utterly failed to attain its object. After Ptolemy Philadelphus' death Antiochus again made Laodice queen, and divorced Berenice. To avenge herself for the manner in which she had been treated, Laodice poisoned her husband at Ephesus, and secured the accession to the throne of her son, Seleucus Callinicus. She shortly after contrived to assassinate her rival Berenice, together with her infant son. Many others were also put to death at the same time, “they who brought her” (Berenice) to Syria being

¹ She was, according to Polyænus, his own father's daughter.

among the victims. Those barbarous acts, however, caused a revolt among Seleucus' Syrian subjects, and led to long wars with Egypt.

So far the story is tolerably plain. The Hebrew text of Daniel, however, presents certain difficulties. The word "*arm*" throughout the chapter is used in the sense of "*army*." Berenice's position at the court of Syria during Ptolemy Philadelphus' lifetime was safeguarded by the conviction that her rights would be upheld by the power of Egypt. As the Hebrew noun for "*arm*" is both masculine and feminine, the clause "*she shall not retain the strength of arm*" might be otherwise rendered "*and the arm shall not retain strength*." The latter rendering is, however, opposed to the Massoretic accentuation, and yields an inferior sense.

There is little difficulty in the translation of "*she shall be given up*." The verb "*to give*" is constantly used throughout the book in that signification, although it is true that when so used it is combined with some qualifying expression.¹ The phrase is used in ch. viii. 12, 13 without such qualifying words. The desire to "read into" the passage certain historical facts has been already mentioned.

The fact that in ver. 6 the kings of the north and the south are not the same individuals throughout the verse causes no difficulty. Those terms are employed throughout the chapter almost in the same way as "*Israel*" is employed on many occasions, and as the phrases "*he*" and "*they*" are used throughout the Book of Wisdom.

The word in the Hebrew text must be rendered "*her father*." Ptolemy Philadelphus, however, never fell into the hands of Seleucus Callinicus. The marginal render-

¹ Such as "*with his hand*," etc.

ing in the A.V., "*whom she brought forth,*" is an attempt to reconcile the text of Daniel with the history. The latter translation would require the Hebrew word to be differently pointed.

That modification of the text is, however, suspicious.¹ The variants which exist in the ancient versions prove that the verse, even in the Hebrew, has been subjected to arbitrary changes.²

The paraphrast, as we may conveniently term the author of the text as it lies before us, proceeds (ver. 7) : "*But out of a shoot from her roots shall one stand up in his place (i.e. in the room of Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt).*" What, however, is to be understood by "*her roots*" ?³ Bevan and others assume that it means "*an offshoot of the roots from whence Berenice had sprung.*" According to that exposition, "*her roots*" mean "*her parents.*" The expression, however, naturally indicates a shoot from the roots which she herself cast into the ground, namely, one of her sons. The only parallel instance is Isa. xi. 1, where "a shoot (or branch) from his roots" is not a branch from the same stock from which Jesse sprang, but a shoot from the roots thrown out by Jesse. Bevan proposes to alter the text, and appeals in justification to the LXX. (see *Critical Commentary*), which has "*a shoot from his roots.*" That translation does not, however, necessarily indicate that the LXX. had a different reading. It shows, however, that the Greek translators felt the difficulty caused by the

¹ See *Critical Commentary*.

² The LXX. slur over these difficulties, rendering : "*And at the end of years he shall bring them (ἀξει αὐτοῦς); and the king of Egypt shall enter into the kingdom of the north to make treaties.*"

³ Hebrew רִיבְוֹתָיָא . See *Critical Commentary* on the ancient VSS.

comparison of Isa. xi. 1, and therefore amended the text into "*his roots*" in order to bring it into conformity with historical fact. For it was Ptolemy III. Euergetes, the brother of Berenice, and not her son (who was put to death at the same time with herself), who became the avenger of his sister's wrongs.

"*And*"—"the offspring of her shoots" is the subject—"shall come to the army." The phraseology is awkward. It is explained by v. Lengerke, Ewald, and Hitzig to signify, "*and he shall place himself at the head of the army in order to invade Syria.*" Bevan would alter the text and read: "*And he shall bring an army against them.*" Had the latter been the original reading, it never would have been distorted into the form exhibited by the Massoretic text, to which the versions more or less distinctly bear witness.

The appearance which the Hebrew text presents is, however, precisely what might have been expected in a paraphrase. In such paraphrases, or Targums, phrases of the original are retained, although often so modified and obscured by expository comments that, if we possessed only the Targum, it would be often impossible to restore the original text. Our argument to prove that the Hebrew of ch. xi. is such a paraphrase is cumulative, based on an induction of particulars, the full force of which cannot be perceived until all the particulars have been duly considered. The middle portion of the chapter, which details the wars of Syria and Egypt, in its present form appears to be a paraphrastic Hebrew translation of an original Aramaic writing.

Verse 7 proceeds: "*And he shall come into a fortress of the king of the north.*" The Hebrew phrase is awkward, and appears like a translation of an original imperfectly

understood, and interpreted in the light of later history. Hitzig considers Seleucia in Cilicia to be the fortress referred to, which was captured by the king of Egypt in the war and held for many years.¹

The last clause of ver. 7 is translated in the R.V. "*and shall deal against them and prevail.*" The phrase $\text{וְיִשָּׁרְטוּ בָהֶם}$ is late Hebrew. The idea imported into it by some critics, "*do according to his will,*" is not contained in the phrase. It rather means *to show oneself active in any matter, to be busied with it.* The R.V. regards the two verbs together as forming one idea, "*shall deal against them and prevail,*" i.e. he shall prevail in his dealings against them, viz. the fortresses, or the Syrians.

Ptolemy III. Euergetes, according to the inscription on the *Marmor Adulitanum*, i.e. the marble slab set up at Adule a port of Abyssinia, claimed to be not only king of Egypt and Libya, but king over Syria and Phœnicia, Cyprus, Lycia, Karia, and the isles of the Cyclades. He set out on his expedition against Seleucus II. Callinicus, son of Antiochus Theos and Laodice, with a large army consisting of cavalry, infantry, and elephants, accompanied by a considerable fleet. He overran in his victorious career not only Palestine, but Mesopotamia, Babylonia, Media, and Persia. His victorious armies crossed the Euphrates, and subdued for a time portions of Asia Minor, Cilicia, Pamphylia, and Ionia. Ptolemy carried back to Egypt the sacred images and spoils which had been taken away from Egypt in the days of Cambyses. It was mainly on account of his having thus brought back the ancient sacred images of Egypt that he received the

¹ The בָּהֶם , "*against them,*" "*with them,*" or "*into them,*" might in that case be explained of the Syrians. Bevan agrees with Hitzig in that interpretation.

title of Euergetes. His antagonist, Seleucus II. Callinicus, crossed the Taurus to oppose him, but after a severe defeat fell back behind that mountain range, where he remained securely entrenched until Ptolemy's return to Egypt. Seleucus then issued forth from those fastnesses and reconquered a large portion of the country. Several of the inscriptions in Hicks' *Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions* refer to Ptolemy's campaign.¹

Verse 8 continues the recital of the exploits of the Egyptian king: "*And also their gods, with their molten images, with their precious vessels of gold and of silver, shall he bring with the captives into Egypt.*"

The second part of the verse has been diversely rendered. According to the Hebrew accentuation, it should be, "*And he shall stand for years, away from the king of the north,*" or, "*more than the king of the north,*" i.e., as Calvin explains it, "*more powerful than the king of Syria.*"

Von Lengerke, Hitzig, and Ewald render the whole: "*He shall refrain for some years from attacking the king of the north.*"²

In the decree of the Egyptian priests issued in B.C. 239 in honour of Ptolemy Euergetes—discovered at Tanis in the Delta of Egypt, published by Wescher (*Revue Arch.*, xiv., 1866), and given in Hicks' *Manual*, p. 310—mention is expressly made of the sacred images which were carried off by the Persians in the days of Cambyses being brought back by Ptolemy, and restored to their respective shrines in the land of Egypt.

¹ See, on these portions of history, Mahaffy's *Empire of the Ptolemies*, chap. vi.

² Those scholars appeal to Gen. xxix. 35; so Gen. xxx. 9; but the meaning in both those passages is *to cease* to do the act expressed by the infinitive following, so that the cases are not analogous. Neither is 2 Kings iv. 6 a case in point, "*and the oil stayed.*"

Ptolemy Euergetes was recalled to Egypt by reason of domestic disturbances. After his departure, Seleucus II. recovered the greater part of the territories which had been temporarily annexed to Egypt. Seleucus' successes are alluded to in the decree of the people of Smyrna concerning a treaty with Magnesia preserved in a slab in the Marble Room, Oxford. The decree is given in Hicks' *Greek Inscriptions*, p. 300. Its date is probably B.C. 243, shortly after Ptolemy had retreated into Egypt. The invasion of Egypt by Seleucus mentioned in the next verse probably occurred a little later.

“*And he shall come into the kingdom of the king of the south, and shall return to his (own) land.*” According to Justin (*Lib. xxvii. 2*), Seleucus II., after Ptolemy's return to Egypt, collected a large fleet to subdue the cities which had joined the Egyptians. The fleet, however, was utterly destroyed by a tempest, and the king himself escaped with only a few followers. The disaster, however, proved beneficial to the Syrian monarch, for it aroused popular sympathy, which, owing to his former crimes, had been sorely lacking. Hence he was able in a short time after his catastrophe to collect a large army for the invasion of Egypt. That army was, however, totally defeated in the first engagement, and Seleucus again escaped with a few adherents. Ptolemy Euergetes, however, learning that Antiochus Hierax was coming to the support of his brother Seleucus, concluded a truce for ten years with the latter monarch. Hence the incessant wars between Syria and Egypt for a time came to a close. The Book of Daniel takes no notice whatever of the wars which afterwards broke out between those two brothers.

Simple and clear as the Hebrew text of ver. 9 is, a difficulty occurs in the LXX. translation. It is: “*And*

the king of Egypt shall enter into a kingdom for some days, and shall return to his land."

Owing to the absence of the article before βασιλείαν, and the tendency exhibited by the LXX. to increase the number of references in the prophecy to Jewish history, it is possible that a reference may be intended in their translation to Ptolemy's visit to Jerusalem at the end of his former campaign. That visit is mentioned by Josephus, not in the *Antiquities*, but in the opening of the fifth chapter of book ii. *Against Apion*, in the following words :—

"Now this Apion was unacquainted with almost all the kings of those Macedonians, whom he pretends to have been his progenitors, who were yet very well affected towards us ; for the third of those Ptolemies, who was called Euergetes, when he had gotten possession of all Syria by force, did not offer his thank-offerings to the Egyptian gods for his victory, but came to Jerusalem, and according to our own laws offered many sacrifices to God, and dedicated to Him such gifts as were suitable to such a victory."

Verse 10 is the commencement of a new section. It may be rendered : "*And his sons shall carry on war, and gather a multitude of great forces which shall even come 'and overflow and pass over,' and return, and they shall carry on war even to the fortress.*"

These sons were the sons of Seleucus II., namely, Seleucus III., surnamed Keraunos, and Antiochus III., surnamed the Great. Both became in turn kings of Syria. The reign of Seleucus III. lasted only three years. He neither carried on any war against Egypt, nor did he make preparations for such a campaign. Circumstances compelled him to devote his attention to Asia Minor, and

to concentrate all his energies on the war with Attalus, king of Pergamos, who at that time overran a considerable portion of Asia. In the prosecution of that campaign Seleucus II. was assassinated by one of his own officers.¹

The Hebrew text speaks of *sons* in the plural. The LXX. have corrected the text into the singular, with the object of making the prophecy harmonise with the facts of history.

The Hebrew may be translated, "*stir themselves up.*" The A.V. renders it somewhat freely, "*shall be stirred up.*" The root is employed in Hebrew in the sense of *carrying on war*, and in Assyrian several words derived from the same root are used in that signification.² Behrmann suggests that the singular is used in the latter clauses of the verse to indicate that it was Antiochus the Great alone who actually entered Egypt. It is preferable, however, to regard "*the multitude*" as the subject of the verb.

The phrase translated "*a multitude of great forces*" (R.V.) has been rendered by some "*a multitude of great riches*" (Meinhold), and the latter translation is possible. But the contrast presented in the text by the employment of four verbs in the singular in succession after two in the plural, with which the verse opens, makes it more probable that "*multitude*" is the subject alike of those verbs, in which case the qualifying genitive must mean "*numerous forces.*" This "*multitude of numerous forces*" is described as passing into the dominions of Egypt, inundating that country, and flowing over it like a mighty river. The

¹ See E. R. Bevan's *House of Seleucus*, vol. i. pp. 204-5.

² As the same word and form is employed in the latter meaning, there is no reason why it should be rendered, with Behrmann, in the first clause "*shall stir themselves up,*" and in the latter "*shall carry on war.*" On the use of the infinitive absolute after the verb in the phrase וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוֶינָהּ, see Ges.-Kautzsch, § 113. 3 b.

phrase "*overflow and pass over*" is a quotation from Isa. viii. 8, where the invasion of the king of Assyria is compared to an inundation of the waters of the Euphrates. The Euphrates at the time referred to in Daniel formed part of the kingdom of Syria.

Antiochus the Great ascended the throne of Syria in B.C. 223. Though only a youth of fifteen, he showed considerable ability in confronting the difficulties by which he was encompassed. Having subdued insurrections in Media and Persia, and added a new province to his eastern possessions, he turned his attention to Egypt. Ptolemy Euergetes, the powerful and popular monarch of Egypt, died about a year after Antiochus the Great became king of Syria (B.C. 221-20), and Ptolemy IV. Philopater, who succeeded to the rule of Egypt, was a man of a different stamp from his father. It was gravely suspected that the new king had actually poisoned his father. On his accession to the throne he murdered his mother, brother, and uncle, and then gave himself up to a life of sensuality. Under such circumstances, Antiochus might naturally have cherished the hope of being able to recover the cities and provinces wrested by Egypt from Syria in former years.

Antiochus declared war against Egypt in B.C. 218. In the commencement of the campaign he gained considerable victories. Seleucia, on the Orontes, was besieged and captured. Tyre, Ptolemais, and other towns fell into the conqueror's hands. The Syrian armies swept, as described in Daniel, like the waters of a mighty river over Phœnicia and Judæa. For some cause or other, however, those successes were not followed up. Antiochus agreed to an armistice, and the Syrian army went into winter quarters. These events are probably glanced

at in the concluding clause of ver. 10: "*And it (the army) returned, and they warred up to his fortress.*"

It is useless to indulge in speculations as to the particular "fortress" indicated. The chronicles of the period do not give sufficient information to enable one to arrive at any definite conclusion.

In the spring of the following year, at the close of the armistice, Antiochus took the field with an army of 62,000 infantry, 6000 cavalry, and 102 elephants. Ptolemy IV. Philopater, aroused from his life of sensuality, marched to encounter the Syrian invader with an army superior in the number of soldiers, though inferior in elephants. Ptolemy gained a victory over the Syrian army at Raphia (B.C. 217), where Antiochus lost some 10,000 on the battle-field, 4000 being taken prisoners. In consequence of that battle Judæa and Cælo-Syria fell again under the Egyptian rule.

These events are described in Daniel (verses 11, 12). "*And the king of the south shall be aroused to anger, and shall go forth, and war with him, with the king of the north, and he (the king of the north, or Antiochus) shall put in array a mighty multitude, and the multitude shall be given into his hand,*" namely, into the hand of the king of the south. Compare 1 Kings xx. 28.

"*And the multitude shall be swept away (as by a storm; compare Isa. xl. 24, xli. 16, lvii. 13; and also Dan. ii. 35 Aram.), and his heart shall be lifted up (with pride), and he shall cast down ten thousands, and shall not show himself strong.*"

This statement corresponds with the facts. Although Ptolemy gained a brilliant victory, he did not follow up the success as he might have done. Desirous of returning back to his pleasures in Egypt, he hastily

made peace with Antiochus, who for the time surrendered up to him the possession of Cælo-Syria and Judæa. Ptolemy entered Jerusalem in triumph, where he appears to have treated the Jews with consideration. But the attempt on the part of the Jews to hinder him from entering into the sacred precincts of the Temple gave mortal offence to the Egyptian monarch—an offence which, according to 3 Maccabees, was later cruelly avenged upon the Jews in Alexandria. No reference is made in Daniel to that attempt. After Ptolemy's return to Egypt he abandoned himself entirely to a life of debauchery, and died about twelve years after.

“*The multitude*” mentioned throughout (as proved by ver. 13) is the army of the Syrian monarch. The phrase “*to lift up the heart*” is, however, used uniformly of a man's being *lifted up with pride*, and not of an army being *inspired with courage*.

The peace between Syria and Egypt lasted over twelve years. Antiochus the Great gained considerable strength by successful campaigns in other directions. He suppressed the rebellion of Achæus, defeated the Parthians and the Bactrians, though he was unable completely to subdue those countries. He even marched into India, and secured a supply of elephants from that country. On the death of Ptolemy IV. Philopater, Ptolemy V. Epiphanes succeeded to the throne of Egypt, being then only five years old. The time was therefore considered opportune for Antiochus the Great resuming war against Egypt, and the second expedition of that monarch against Egypt is described in ver. 13.

“*And the king of the north shall return and put in array*”¹

¹ The first verb may, however, be regarded as used adverbially, in which case the meaning will be “*shall again put in array.*”

a multitude greater than the first, and at the end of the times (consisting of) years, he shall verily come with great power, and with much substance.

“And in those times many shall stand up against the king of the south, and the sons of the violent of thy people shall lift up themselves to establish the vision, but they shall fall.”

At this eventful crisis, when his dominions were invaded by Antiochus, the Egyptian king had not only to contend with enemies from without, but to confront insurrection within his own territories. Philip V., the powerful king of Macedon, had entered into an alliance with the king of Syria, and other enemies of Ptolemy Epiphanes raised their heads in various provinces.

Among those who espoused the part of Antiochus were the Jewish people. They had already suffered considerably by the wars between Egypt and Syria; and in the latter years of Ptolemy Philopater they endured cruel oppression in Egypt at the hands of his mistress Agathoclea and her brother Agathocles. The position of the Jews was no doubt ameliorated when Ptolemy V. himself at a later period assumed the reins of government.

The second part of the verse is susceptible of a double interpretation, and it is therefore difficult to come to any certain conclusion as to its exact meaning. By the *“sons of violent men”* may be understood the more disaffected or turbulent part of the people. The Jews at that crisis were in subjection under the yoke of their old oppressors, and that subjection was peculiarly galling. The Hebrew prophets, like Haggai and Zechariah, and even Daniel, had all predicted their deliverance, and the advent of a day when the yoke of the stranger should be broken from off their shoulders.

Hence the text may mean that certain violent persons,

filled with patriotic zeal, would at such a crisis take up arms for the purpose of regaining national liberty, and of fulfilling the vision or prophecy of the seers of old, although they were destined to fail in their attempt. This view of the passage has been adopted by divers commentators. It is the most natural interpretation of the expression "*to establish the vision.*"

But the phrase may be otherwise explained. Certain violent persons were in some way or other to lift themselves up, and, by the ruin which fell upon their own heads, became in their own persons striking examples of the fulfilment of the Divine threats uttered by the prophets. The phrase would thus be employed in a somewhat similar sense to that in which Jude (ver. 4) speaks of the evil-doers of his day as "of old ordained to this condemnation."

Jerome gives a still different interpretation. He observes that, in the wars between Antiochus the Great and Ptolemy, some of the Jews sided with the Syrian, and some with the Egyptian monarch. Onias, the high priest, fled into Egypt with a considerable number of Jews, and, having been received kindly by Ptolemy, built in Egypt the temple of Heliopolis, under the pretext of fulfilling thereby the prophecy of Isaiah (ch. xix. 19). Jerome refers the statement "*but they shall fall*" to the final overthrow of that temple by the Romans shortly after the destruction of the Temple of Jerusalem.

That interpretation of the great Church Father is, however, incorrect. The prophecy in Dan. xi. 14 speaks of events which occurred in the time of Antiochus the Great. The erection of the temple at Heliopolis in B.C. 167, by the high priest Onias IV., occurred forty years later.

Dr Schlatter, in an article contributed to the first Heft of the *Z. für A.T.W.* for 1894, considers there is a definite meaning conveyed by the clause under discussion. He regards the phrase "the sons of the violent" to point to "the sons of Tobias," who are mentioned both in 2 Macc. and by Josephus as conspicuous leaders of Jewish factions.

Of Tobias the historians of the period afford no information, although he seems to have been a man of influence. His son Joseph was the well-known farmer of the taxes of Syria, who rose to favour at the court of Egypt, and whose life and deeds are recorded by Josephus (*Antiq.* xii. 4). His maternal uncle was the high priest Onias II., stigmatised by Josephus as a mercenary character, but whose hesitation to pay over the revenue of Palestine to the commissioner sent by the Egyptian monarch may have been caused by political reasons.¹

It is not easy to see what would have been the wisest course for Jews to have pursued in the intricate relations which then prevailed between the monarchs of Egypt and Syria. Joseph, the son of Tobias, had seven sons by the wife to whom he was first married. The mother of Hyrkanus his youngest son was his own niece. In the struggle for power after Joseph's death between the seven elder sons and Hyrkanus, the high priest Simon II. took part with the former, and Hyrkanus was compelled to leave Jerusalem. He retired beyond the Jordan, where

¹ Dr J. P. Mahaffy, in his *Empire of the Ptolemies*, is not inclined to regard the story of Josephus as pure history, though admitting that it contains historical elements which are, however, not introduced in strictly chronological order. Willrich, in his *Juden u. Griechen vor der makkabäischen Erhebung* (1896), considers the story as pure legend, and so does Wellhausen (*Israel. u. jüdisch. Gesch.* 196-198).

he built a strong castle, and beautified it in a wonderful manner. Under the shelter of that fortress he maintained himself for many years. In later days Hyrkanus became an ally of the king of Egypt. His brethren, "the sons of Tobias," took an active part on the side of Antiochus Epiphanes, and joined the party of Onias III., and afterwards of Menelaus, the apostate high priest, who co-operated with the Syrian king in the wicked attempt to extirpate the Jewish religion.

These "sons of Tobias" were "sons of violence," deeds of rapine were in their hands, "wasting and destruction in their path" (comp. Isa. lix. 6). Their wickedness ultimately recoiled upon their own heads, although they were successful for a little season. Schlatter considers it probable that the high priest Menelaus may have been a member of the family. Through the assistance of "the sons of Tobias," Menelaus was able to ingratiate himself into the favour of the Syrian monarch.

If it could be conclusively proved that these "sons of Tobias" were the persons referred to in the passage, the fact would be another argument in favour of our hypothesis, namely, that the chapter before us is a paraphrase of an original vision of Daniel, in which the outlines of that vision are intermingled with a running interpretation—the paraphrase in many cases taking the place of the original text.

A serious difficulty, however, in the way of adopting Schlatter's conjecture is that the passage refers to events which occurred in the early part of the reign of Antiochus the Great, while the violent deeds of "the sons of Tobias" occurred thirty years later, subsequent to the events spoken of in the verses which follow the passage

in which the "sons of violent men" are referred to. That conjecture must therefore be set aside.

Moreover, if "the sons of Tobias" played a conspicuous part in that particular crisis of the Jewish nation, one would naturally expect some reference to be made to the fact in the LXX. version. For the LXX. evidently modified the text, here as elsewhere, in order to bring it into agreement with the facts of the history with which they were familiar.

The history glanced at in ver. 14 and the following verses is as follows:—At the outbreak of the war with Syria, Scopas, the celebrated Etolian general, who had entered into the Egyptian service, was despatched with a powerful army into Judæa and Cælo-Syria. Scopas was at first successful, and reduced Judæa to subjection, Antiochus having been then engaged in a campaign against Attalus, king of Pergamos. But Antiochus, having through fear of the Romans concluded peace with Attalus, marched in person against Scopas, whom he defeated in a great battle fought at Mount Panium, near the source of the Jordan. That battle put an end for ever to the rule of the Ptolemies in Palestine.¹ Scopas fell back with 10,000 men to Sidon, where he was closely besieged by Antiochus. The efforts made by the Egyptians to raise the siege were unsuccessful, and Scopas was forced by famine to surrender, and was sent back to Egypt "*nudus cum sociis*," as Jerome expresses it. The siege of Sidon is referred to by Daniel in ver. 15 of this chapter. After that victory the provinces of Cælo-Syria, Phœnicia, and Judæa were speedily overrun by the Syrian armies. On the appearance of Antiochus' troops before Jerusalem, the Jews opened the gates to the invaders, and helped

¹ See E. R. Bevan's *House of Seleucus*, vol. ii. p. 37.

them to besiege the Egyptian garrison, which retired into the citadel (Josephus, *Antiq.* xii. 3. 3). Josephus records with approval the reception accorded to Antiochus, and gives in full letters of Antiochus, in which that monarch extolled the Jewish people, and granted special privileges to the Temple at Jerusalem. On the other hand, Hävernick and others consider the conduct of the Jewish people as unjustifiable, and think it is condemned in this verse of Daniel. The Jewish nation cannot be fairly charged with ingratitude on the ground of the favours bestowed on them forty years before, in the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Those favours could not have weighed much in the eyes of the Palestinian Jews, who, at a later date, suffered severely at the hands of the successors of Philadelphus. The Palestinian Jews, not unnaturally, imagined at the time that there was a prospect of peace being restored to their country under the rule of Antiochus. They, indeed, only obtained a change of masters, and the tyranny and oppression which they underwent at the hands of the successors of Antiochus the Great were ultimately more terrible than anything which had been endured at the hands of the Ptolemies.

“And the king of the north shall come, and cast up a mount, and take a fortified city (a city of fortifications), and the arms of the south shall not stand, neither his chosen people, for there shall be no strength to stand” (ver. 15).

“And he (Antiochus III., the Great) who cometh against him (Ptolemy V. Epiphanes) shall do according to his will, and none shall stand before him, and he shall stand in the glorious land (the land of Israel, as the Syriac rightly explains it), and destruction in his hand” (ver. 16).

The phrase *“and destruction in his hand”* has been variously interpreted. The A.V. takes the Hebrew noun

as a verb, rendering "*which by his hand shall be consumed.*" In such an antithetical clause the subject would have been expressed. Hence it is preferable to regard the word as a noun. The natural interpretation of the clause, in the context in which it stands, would be to regard the "destruction" as affecting the land of Palestine, the king of the north being described as a devastator of that country. Antiochus, however, did not destroy the Holy Land, but showed himself kindly disposed towards the Jewish people. Hence expositors on all sides (Kranichfeld alone excepted) explain the "destruction" as falling upon the land of Egypt. Egypt is not, however, named in the context. It is easier to suppose an allusion made to the Egyptian armies in the Holy Land over which Antiochus proved victorious.

It is, however, more probable that the text here contains some words of the original prophecy. The Greek translators all view the word "destruction" as a verb.

"*And he (the king of the north, Antiochus) shall set his face to come (enter, namely, into Egypt) with the strength of all his kingdom*" (ver. 17).

The phrase "*and shall set his face,*" i.e. "*it before his face,*" means "*shall design,*" or *make it his aim and object.*

Antiochus the Great had entered into an alliance with Philip V. of Macedon to divide between them the dominions of Egypt. But while Antiochus was engaged in the subjugation of Asia Minor, the Romans overthrew the power of Philip, and when Antiochus collected his forces for the invasion of Egypt, the Romans sent an embassy, B.C. 196, to command the king to desist, as Egypt and its monarch had been placed under Roman protection. A second Roman embassy required Antiochus to surrender all the countries he had taken from

Ptolemy. Antiochus at first returned a haughty reply to the demands of Rome, but he had the wisdom to perceive that it was inopportune to prosecute his campaign against Egypt. The invasion of that country was therefore definitely abandoned, and Antiochus opened friendly negotiations with Ptolemy, with the object of making Egypt an ally in case of a war with Rome.

The second clause of ver. 17 is by the Massoretic punctuation connected with the previous statement, and would be naturally rendered, "*and upright men with him, and he did so.*" By the "*upright,*" or "*righteous,*" the Jewish people are signified, after the analogy of the expression used by Balaam in Num. xxiii. 10. The expression "*upright*" is not really in opposition to ver. 14, in which merely a portion of the nation are spoken of as "*sons of the violent.*" The text indicates that the king of the north would seek to enter Egypt with his army, aided by the Jewish people, and succeed in the attempt.

The statement is, however, in opposition to the known facts of history. Critics, who, from various motives, have sought to demonstrate a minute correspondence between the statements of the chapter and historical facts, have been compelled to suggest other ways of getting over the difficulty. The discrepancy, however, is another argument in favour of the hypothesis that the chapter is in the main an explanatory paraphrase, and not the original prophecy. In this instance also some of the original words of the prophecy are preserved by the paraphrastic translator which do not really coincide with his interpretation. Attempts have been made to bridge over the difficulty. The correction of the text in order to bring it into harmony with history is, however, a

doubtful expedient, and has in this chapter too often to be resorted to.

The second clause of the verse is, "*And the daughter of women he shall give to him to destroy her.*" Such, abstractedly regarded, is the natural explanation of the phrase. In that case, the infinitive would indicate the result, not the object, of the marriage. The phrase might, however, be rendered "*in order to destroy it*" (Egypt). The latter is not a natural interpretation, because Egypt has not been yet mentioned. Hence that interpretation looks like an "after-thought." The phrase "*the daughter of women*" is peculiar, and occurs in no other passage.

The words "*and she shall not stand, and she shall not be for him,*" would be naturally explained of the daughter. The first expression (like the similar phrase in ver. 6) indicates that the marriage would be fatal to "*the daughter.*" The second clause is somewhat enigmatical. The attempt of Bertholdt, v. Lengerke, Maurer, Hitzig, etc., to explain the word "*stand*" as neuter, in reference to the treaty between Antiochus and Ptolemy, is another of the numerous inventions of the critics to try to make the prophecy correspond with history. Meinhold, after Rosenmüller, appeals to Isa. vii. 7 and xiv. 24. But in those passages a covenant or treaty is spoken of in the context. In the passage in Daniel, unless the text be altered, there is no such reference.

The historical events were as follows:—Antiochus, owing to the opposition of the Romans, was compelled to abandon his designs on Egypt. But, as that king foresaw that war with Rome loomed in the near future, he entered into an alliance with Ptolemy, and gave him Cleopatra his daughter to wife, assigning as her dowry the provinces of Cælo-Syria, Phœnicia, and Palestine, with the stipula-

tion, however, that the revenues of those provinces should be equally divided between Syria and Egypt. The arrangement, however, proved to be of short duration. The alliance of Egypt was by no means secured by the marriage. Cleopatra was too independent a woman to act as the agent of her father. When Antiochus at a later period sought the help of Ptolemy in the war he contemplated with Rome, Cleopatra advised her husband to refuse to adopt such a course of action, and induced him to continue in alliance with Rome.

“ And he shall turn round his face towards the coast-lands, and shall take many ; but a commander shall cause to cease his reproach [i.e. the reproach offered by him, the king of the north] to him [the king of the south], nay, even shall return his reproach to him ” (ver. 18).

In the second part of the passage there are considerable difficulties (see *Critical Commentary*). The hand of a paraphrast may possibly be traced throughout. Some phrases of the original prophecy appear to have been retained without their context, and with only a vague idea of their meaning ; the whole passage being supposed to indicate the historical events which the paraphrast imagined were portrayed.¹

After concluding the alliance with Egypt, Antiochus turned his attention to the coast-lands of Asia Minor. The Egyptian possessions along that coast had been by mutual agreement divided between Philip of Macedon and Antiochus. But the Romans, having overcome Philip, declared all the Greek cities of Asia Minor, which had belonged to that monarch, free. The Romans further required Antiochus not only to acknowledge the

¹ Compare the method in which the LXX. have acted in their paraphrase of the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks.

freedom of those cities, but also to surrender all his possessions in Europe. In the war which ensued Antiochus, through neglect of the advice given by Hannibal, was, after some successes in Asia Minor and in Greece, severely defeated on land at Thermopylæ (B.C. 192), as well as in several naval engagements, especially in that at Ephesus, and, after his return into Asia, in the decisive battle of Magnesia (B.C. 190), soon after which event he perished in an attempt to plunder the temple of Bel at Elymais.

These latter events are generally supposed to be glanced at in ver. 19: "*And he shall turn his face towards the fortresses of his own land, and shall stumble and fall, and shall not be found.*"

The sketch of the history of Antiochus the Great given in Dan. xi. closes with ver. 19. The tremendous defeat which the Romans inflicted on that monarch at Magnesia, towards the close of the year B.C. 190, is but slightly alluded to. In consequence, however, of that defeat, Antiochus was obliged to relinquish all his conquests in Greece, and a considerable part of his possessions in Asia Minor. He was further compelled to surrender his fleet to the Romans, to pay within twelve years 15,000 talents as an indemnity for the costs of the war, and to send twenty hostages to Rome, among whom was his younger son, who became afterwards notorious as Antiochus Epiphanes. Arrangements were also made for such an exchange of hostages as might from time to time seem desirable.

In order to raise the enormous yearly tribute required to meet the demands of Rome, Antiochus three years later attempted to plunder the temple of Jupiter at Elymais, but perished in the attempt. He was succeeded

on the throne by his eldest living son, Seleucus IV., surnamed Philopator, in B.C. 187. Seleucus, as heir-apparent, had seen considerable military service, although he does not appear to have been a successful general. He ascended the throne of Syria at a crisis which would have tried the powers of the most consummate commander. The prestige of the Syrian monarchy had been completely shattered by the reverses of Antiochus the Great, and the Seleucidian kingdom was crushed beneath the weight of a tribute which it was too weak to refuse to pay, and under the burden of which it had no power to rise.

Seleucus' reign is briefly alluded to in ver. 20. The language of that verse is, however, obscure. "*And there shall stand up in his place (i.e. in the place of Antiochus the Great) one who shall cause an oppressor to pass over the glory of the kingdom, and in a few days he shall be broken, and not in anger and not in war.*" If the *usus loquendi* be taken into consideration, the Hebrew word can scarcely be explained as "*a raiser of taxes*" (A.V.), or "*an exactor*" (R.V.). In one passage, indeed, the word is employed in that signification (2 Kings xxiii. 35), but its use in all other passages is in favour of the more general term "*oppressor.*" It is employed to describe the taskmasters of Egypt (Exod. iii. 7), and used by Isaiah in several prophetic passages to indicate oppressive rulers.¹ It occurs in two passages of Zechariah, namely, ch. ix. 8 and x. 4.

The phrase "*glory of the kingdom*" is likewise obscure. Von Lengerke and Hitzig consider Jerusalem to be indicated, or, at least, Judæa, termed "*the pleasant land*"

¹ The Hebrew word is used in the sense of an oppressor in Isa. iii 12, xiv. 2. In Isa. lx. 17 it is almost synonymous with "king" as employed in Isa. xxxii. 1.

in ver. 16. But the two phrases are not identical. "It would be," as Bevan observes, "very strange to call Judæa or Jerusalem, the glory of a heathen kingdom."¹ Many critics have explained the passage as referring to the story told in 2 Macc. iii. of Heliodorus being sent by Seleucus to plunder the treasury of the Temple at Jerusalem. A similar story is narrated in 4 Macc. iv., where, however, Apollonius takes the place of Heliodorus. The details of those narratives of attempts made upon the Temple treasury differ considerably. The miraculous character of both histories, and their contradictions, combined with the silence of Josephus, have led eminent critics to regard the story as fabulous. Others, however, regard the narrative as to some extent historical, in order more clearly to demonstrate that Dan. xi. is a mere *vaticinium post eventum*.

The phrase can mean little else than "*the glory of the kingdom.*" The verse is more vague in its signification than those critics are inclined to think, who regard it as a description, historical or legendary, of the days of Seleucus.

In the second part of the verse, the LXX. have dealt freely with the text, in order in that place also to make the prophecy more exactly correspond with history. The Vulgate translation of the verse exhibits another striking evidence of a rendering warped by exegetical considerations: "*Et stabit in loco ejus vilissimus et indignus decore regio.*" The rendering is a comment, and not a translation. Jerome makes no allusion to the "exactions" of Seleucus,

¹ The phrase used in Zech. ix. 8, "*and no oppressor shall pass through them any more,*" is sufficient to show that, had such been the meaning, the verb would have been construed in Daniel with a similar preposition.

or to Heliodorus' attempt on the Temple at Jerusalem. In this particular case Porphyry does not seem to have been satisfied with the fulfilment of the prophecy in the person of Seleucus. He therefore expounded the verse of the king of Egypt, an exposition easily demolished by Jerome.

The close of the verse is correctly rendered by Jerome, "*et in paucis diebus conteretur, non in furore nec in proelio.*" The natural interpretation of the clause is that the king spoken of would be overthrown by some Divine judgment on himself or on his kingdom. The prophecy is wholly silent as to the form which the Divine judgment might assume. It does not necessarily point to assassination.

CHAPTER IX

THE LAST VISION OF DANIEL (*continued*) (CH. XI. 21-39)
—ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES AND HIS CAREER

THE prophecy of Dan. xi. from ver. 21 to ver. 39 is taken up with the record of Antiochus Epiphanes and his reign. That reign was remarkable for the efforts which were made to root out the religion of Jehovah, and to break in pieces the power of the holy nation.

Antiochus Epiphanes was surrendered up to the Romans as one of the twenty hostages who were to be kept at Rome as securities for the due observance of the terms of peace imposed by the Romans. He remained at Rome for several years after the conclusion of peace. Circumstances of which nothing is known led Seleucus to send to Rome, in the room of Antiochus, his own son and legitimate successor, Demetrius, and to recall Antiochus. On Antiochus' way back to Antioch tidings reached him in Greece of the murder of Seleucus by Heliodorus, and of the latter having ascended the throne. Antiochus proceeded without any delay to Syria, dethroned and punished the usurper, and seated himself in the place of authority. Demetrius, the legitimate heir to the throne of Syria, was at that time only twelve years of age; and Antiochus might well have pointed out to the Romans that a child was unfit at such a conjuncture to guide the destinies of Syria.

Antiochus Epiphanes is described in ver. 21 as follows : “ *And in his place (that is, of Seleucus IV.) shall stand up a contemptible person, to whom they had not given the honour of the kingdom* ” (ver. 21). So the R.V. The pluperfect translation, however, on the one hand savours somewhat of a comment ; while, on the other, the A.V. rendering, “ *shall not give the honour of the kingdom,* ” is not correct history. The opening perfect in the verse in the Hebrew text must be rendered as a future. Hence the perfect that continues the narration ought to be interpreted in the same sense, especially as it is followed by another perfect which has to be translated as a future, or, at least, as an aorist.

The verse continues : “ *And he shall come in suddenly.* ” This rendering perhaps is better than the “ *peaceably* ” of the A.V., though the latter might be a fair translation. The R.V. rendering, “ *in time of security,* ” introduces a new idea, scarcely consistent with the fact that Heliodorus, who usurped the throne after murdering Seleucus, had to be overthrown—a change not effected without some disturbance of public order. There is no necessity to import into the phrase, as is sometimes done, the new idea of “ *unexpectedly,* ” or “ *unawares.* ”

“ *And shall obtain the kingdom by flatteries.* ” From the account given by Livy of the conduct of Antiochus when a hostage at Rome, Antiochus probably made use of flatteries in securing for himself the reins of government at Antioch. The histories of the period, however, contain no record of the exercise of such “ *flatteries,* ” and it is well not to build much upon the statements of a school of criticism too prone to assume as indisputable history what is at best only conjectural.

It is usual to see in the expression “ *contemptible* ” a

reference to the "sinful root" of 1 Macc. i. 10. But it must be remembered that Jehoiakim is described in Jeremiah xxii. 28 as "*a contemptible broken pot*," and the same term is used twice of the Messiah in Isa. liii. 3. There is no proof that the Hebrew writer had in his mind the contrast afterwards drawn between the title Epiphanes (*famous*), assumed by Antiochus, and its parody Epimanes (*mad*). Livy states that the conduct of Antiochus was so strange during his sojourn at Rome that people used to think him mad. Such freaks at Rome may have been caused by a policy like that which David displayed at the court of Achish (1 Sam. xxi. 12-15). Seleucus IV. considered him a man of ability, whom it would be useful to have at his side, and his later campaigns in Egypt showed considerable military ability. If Antiochus Epiphanes recoiled before the threats of the Roman legate, he proved by his timely surrender on that occasion that he was not madman enough to involve the kingdom in a war which could have had but one conclusion.

Antiochus was, no doubt, one of whom the prophet of Jehovah might well exclaim: "The virgin daughter of Zion hath despised thee and laughed thee to scorn" (Isa. xxxvii. 22). For in the eyes of a prophet of Jehovah, "a contemptible one is despised, but he honoureth them that fear Jehovah" (Ps. xv. 4).

The text, therefore, in its present shape, does not contain any clear or distinct description of Antiochus. It does not possess those marked features which might well have been expected from a prophetic history written later than the events described. There are phrases which lead us to regard the prophecy as "touched up" by a later paraphrast. The expression "*contemptible*" appears to be one of those after-touches, though that is far from certain.

Underlying the enigmatical statement, "*they shall not give to him (or men shall not give him) the glory of the kingdom,*" one can well imagine some expression occurred in the prophecy, when originally penned, akin to the phraseology of Ps. xxi. 6, where it said by the Psalmist of the God-appointed king, "Honour and majesty dost thou lay upon him." The statement, "*they shall not give to him the glory of the kingdom,*" could scarcely have been penned by a writer fully conversant with the facts of Antiochus' history.

The translation of the LXX. supports the hypothesis. They render the verse: "*And there shall stand up in his place a contemptible person, and there shall not be given to him the glory of a king,¹ and he shall come suddenly; a king shall prevail in his inheritance.*"²

Modern critics are right in interpreting in some way or other the entire chapter, from ver. 21 to the end, as having more or less distinct reference to Antiochus and the times following. It is absurd to interpret these verses, with Jerome (after Hippolytus and other Church Fathers), of the imaginary Antichrist of the latter days. Jerome is, indeed, positive on that point. So far as ver. 20 inclusive he states that he is in accord in the main with Porphyry as to the interpretation of the chapter. But of the following twenty-four verses, as well as of portions of ch. xii., he says: "*Nostri autem hæc omnia de Antichristo prophetari arbitrantur, qui ultimo tempore futurus est.*" Jerome is, however, not consistent. For in the after verses he explains many events as fulfilled in the history of

¹ "*Contemptible*" is in this place rendered *εὐκαταφρόνητος*. Notice the attempt of the LXX. to smooth away the difficulties existing in the Hebrew text.

² See *Critical Commentary*.

Antiochus Epiphanes. Pusey agrees in the main with Jerome's interpretation. It is extraordinary to maintain that so much should be told in the chapter of Alexander the Great and the kings of Syria who followed him, and that just at the very point when the prophecy begins really to touch the interests of the holy nation, it should break off and pass over to the days immediately preceding the Second Advent of Christ. Such an interpretation will never satisfy real Biblical students. Nor is the theory of a double interpretation of prophecy satisfactory. It is incongruous to regard a prophecy first as predicting in detail events which were to occur prior to the beginning of Messianic days, and then as predicting a second set of events to take place at the end of the world. Such a theory may have been excusable in the loose interpretations of bygone days; it is indefensible in the present age of critical interpretation.

It will be remembered that peace was concluded between Antiochus the Great, king of Syria, and Ptolemy V. Epiphanes, of Egypt, on the basis that the Egyptian monarch should marry Cleopatra, daughter of Antiochus, and that the provinces of Cælo-Syria and Palestine should be assigned to Cleopatra as her dowry. The Syrian troops never actually evacuated those provinces, although the tribute of those lands was for a time divided between the kings of Syria and Egypt. Ptolemy V., however, was not willing permanently to put up with such a state of affairs, and had commenced preparations for another war with Syria to recover those lost provinces, when he was carried off by poison, B.C. 181. His son, Ptolemy VI. Philometor, then a mere child, succeeded to the throne of Egypt, and Cleopatra acted as the regent of the kingdom. That able woman contrived to keep peace with Syria for nearly eight

years. But after her death in B.C. 173, the ministers and guardians of the child-king, namely, Eulæus and Lenæus, declared war against Antiochus Epiphanes in order to recover the much-coveted territories.

This led to Antiochus Epiphanes' first campaign against Egypt, which proved a brilliant success. The Egyptian forces were overthrown in B.C. 170 in the decisive battle of Pelusium. The Syrian armies overran Egypt, and penetrated as far as Memphis. The youthful Egyptian monarch was either taken captive by Antiochus, or surrendered up to that king from motives of policy. Antiochus, actuated by similar motives, treated the boy-king ostensibly with great kindness, and won him over for a season to his side.

Such are the events, in the opinion of the majority of critics, detailed in Dan. xi. 22, 23 : "*And the arms of a flood shall be swept away from before him, and they shall be shivered in pieces, and also a prince of covenant (i.e. a prince confederate with him). And from the time of entering into alliance with him he shall work craftily, and shall go up, and become strong with a small nation.*"

There is here the ring of genuine prophetic language. In Isa. viii. 7, 8, the invading army of Assyria is described as a mighty river overflowing its banks, and sweeping away everything by the force of its mighty waters. The phrase is employed earlier in this chapter of Daniel (ver. 10) in the same signification, and again recurs in ver. 25.¹ The expression cannot be used of an army acting on the defensive, and borne down in flight, like the Egyptian army at the battle of Pelusium. Antiochus, having mobilised his army with great rapidity, was able

¹ This impression is supported, too, by the parallel passage in Isa. xxviii. 15, שׂוֹמֵם שֶׁקֶף כִּי יֵעָבֹר.

to invade Egypt before the Egyptian forces were able to cross the frontiers. The Syrian forces might well be compared to an overwhelming deluge, although such a comparison does not suit the armies of Egypt.¹

Bevan, with his peculiar fondness for conjectures, proposes to alter the Massoretic punctuation. No violence is done to the Hebrew by his conjecture, although we prefer to adhere to the more difficult rendering of the Massorettes, inasmuch as we consider that the passage here combines fragments of the original prophecy mixed up with additions by a later paraphrast.

Hävernick maintains that the "*prince of covenant*" cannot well signify any other person than the king of Egypt. It is an assumption to affirm that "*covenant*" in Daniel always indicates the Jewish religion. The phrase simply means "*a prince in league.*"² There is no evidence whatever to show that Onias III., the Jewish high priest at the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes, was an opponent of that monarch. Onias had been held in high esteem by Seleucus, and there was as yet no reason why he should have been on bad terms with Antiochus. Onias was merely murdered at the instigation of his rival Menelaus. If 2 Macc. iv. 37 can be relied on, Antiochus, when the murder was brought under his notice, expressed great

¹ Behrmann seeks to evade the difficulty by asserting that the armies which opposed the advance of Antiochus into Egypt are designated "*armies of the flood,*" i.e. of the Divine judgment, "because the editor recognises in them instruments of the Nemesis against Antiochus." How any armies so soon scattered and broken could have been regarded by the most stupid author or editor as instruments of a Divine Nemesis is hard to comprehend. Moreover, up to this period Antiochus had not committed any act which called for an avenging Nemesis.

² See *Critical Commentary*.

indignation, and commanded Andronicus, the Syrian official who performed the act, to be put to death on the spot where the murder had been committed. The murder of Onias III., with the quarrels between Menelaus and Jason, the aspirants for the high priesthood, had no connection with the overthrow of the Egyptian army, though closely connected with the narrative of Antiochus' evil deeds at a later period.

Hävernick regards the expression "*prince of covenant*" as used in anticipation of the league mentioned in the verse following. The explanation is not quite satisfactory ; it is not, however, necessary to interpret all the details of the prophecy. Our contention is that, so far from the prophetic narrative in many cases exhibiting marks of having been written after the events recorded, it is difficult, and in some cases impossible, to point out the meaning of several of its details. That fact is one of the many indications which the chapter presents of being a paraphrastic interpretation of a prophecy, rather than a *verbatim* copy of the original.

However strange may be the LXX. translation of the expressions in the verse, it is clear that those translators understood the passage in the same manner as Jerome. The following is Jerome's explanation :—"Antiochus, sparing the boy (Ptolemy Philometor), and pretending friendship, went up to Memphis, and there receiving the kingdom after the custom in Egypt, saying that he would look out for the interests of the boy, with a small number of people subjugated to himself the whole of Egypt."

Verse 24 continues the general narrative of the doings of Antiochus Epiphanes in Egypt. "*Suddenly he shall even come into the fattest places of a province, and he shall do*

that which his fathers have not done, nor the fathers of his fathers; spoil and plunder and riches shall he scatter among them, and against fortresses shall he devise machinations; and for a time" (ver. 24). Ewald explains "the fattest places of a province" to mean Galilee or Lower Egypt. The expression is peculiar, whether interpreted of one or the other.

The way in which Antiochus acted differently from all his predecessors was in plundering the province in order to lavish gifts upon his friends. That feature of his character is expressly noticed in 1 Macc. iii. 20. It is also alluded to by Polybius, while Livy, who had a mean opinion of Antiochus' character and abilities in general, confesses: "In two great and honourable points his disposition was truly that becoming a king, namely, in the gifts he bestowed upon cities, and in his worship of the gods" (lib. xli. 20).

In the closing words of ver. 24 we light again upon a genuinely Daniehc sentence, "*and that for a season.*" The phrase is of peculiar interest, not only as indicating an upward glance of the prophet heavenwards, while predicting the days of darkness, but also as bringing the paragraph (consisting of verses 22, 23, and 24) to a close. The history of the invasion of Egypt by Antiochus in those verses is set forth in general terms, the same history being repeated a second time in the verses following in more detailed language. Hence it is probable that in this portion of the chapter two distinct paraphrases have been united, which would account for the peculiar character of some of the expressions employed, and serve to explain the use of phraseology not in harmony with other parts of the prophetic narrative.

Verses 25 and 26 form an excellent continuation of the

history from the close of ver. 21, which seems broken in upon by the insertion of verses 22-24: "*And he shall stir up his might and his courage against the king of the south [note here the resumption of the ordinary phraseology] with a great army [no mention is here made of "a small nation"], and the king of the south shall be stirred up to battle with a great army and strong exceedingly; but he shall not stand, for they shall devise devices against him. And they that eat of his dainties shall destroy him, and his army shall overflow, and many shall fall down slain.*"¹

After the battle at Pelusium (which was the only engagement which corresponds with the descriptions in Daniel and 1 Macc.), Antiochus Epiphanes overran the most fertile provinces of Egypt, and got possession by fraud or force of the person of its king. The Egyptians, under the idea that Ptolemy Philometor had acted in a cowardly manner, placed his brother Physcon on the throne. Physcon, with his sister Cleopatra, retreated to the fortified city of Alexandria, the siege

¹ Hävernick observes that the narrative in the first Book of Maccabees was drawn up on the lines of this passage. That narrative contains at least one distinct quotation from the passage in Daniel:—"Now when the kingdom was established before Antiochus, he thought to reign over the land of Egypt (*ὑπέλαβε βασιλεῦσαι γῆς Αἰγύπτου*) in order that he might reign over the two kingdoms; and he entered into Egypt with a great multitude, with chariots, and elephants, and horsemen, and with a great navy (*καὶ ἐν στόλῳ μεγάλῳ*); and he made war against Ptolemy the king of Egypt; and Ptolemy was terrified by his countenance, and fled, and there fell down many wounded (*καὶ ἔπεσον τραυματαῖα πολλοί*: compare the LXX. *καὶ πεσόνται τραυματαῖα πολλοί*), and they captured the strong cities in the land of Egypt, and he took the spoils of the land of Egypt" (1 Macc. i. 16-19).

That passage (ver. 26) affords another indication that the LXX. version of Daniel was in existence prior to the composition of the first Book of Maccabees.

of which was commenced by Antiochus. The intervention of the Romans obliged Antiochus to abandon the siege; and, troubles having broken out in Cilicia, he returned to his own dominions, not, however, before he had set up Ptolemy VII. Philometor as king over the larger part of Egypt. Philometor soon made peace with his brother Physcon. The two brothers reigned for a while as joint-kings of Egypt, and sought the help of Rome against Antiochus. Antiochus, having settled matters in Cilicia, marched once more against Egypt. His fleet was successful at Cyprus, but no allusion to that success occurs in the Book of Daniel. The kings of Egypt were unable to stem the advance of the invader, and were compelled to retire within the walls of Alexandria.

There is, then, a similarity between the description given in Daniel and the first campaign of Antiochus in Egypt. The mighty armies arrayed on both sides correspond satisfactorily, the defeat of the king of Egypt, and the inundating stream of the Syrian army overwhelming the provinces of Egypt. But historians of the period do not record the treachery on the part of the Egyptian nobles alluded to in the Book of Daniel, namely, on the part of the courtiers who fed at the royal table and partook of the dainties of the king. It is possible, however, that such details might have been known to the Jewish writer, whether prophet, paraphrast, or historian. Jerome is honest enough to confess that no mention is made in history of the two kings sitting at one table, each devising mischief against the other, which is so vividly pictured in ver. 27. The LXX. and Theodotion, led probably by the want of correspondence between the prediction and the history, modified ver. 26. See *Critical Commentary*.

“And as for both of these kings (the king of the north and the king of the south), their hearts shall be towards mischief, and even at one table they shall speak lies. But it shall not prosper; for yet an end shall be at the appointed time” (ver. 27).

It may be easy to identify the two kings, and the locality where the feast took place at which they strove mutually to circumvent one another. They were, of course, those of Syria and Egypt. But Jerome, who possessed fuller histories of the period than are now extant, distinctly confesses that this interesting detail cannot be proved from history: “Hoc secundum historiam demonstrari non potest.”

The remark at the close is significant: *“But it shall not prosper; for yet an end shall be at the appointed time.”* The remark corresponds with the similar observation to which we called attention at the end of ver. 24.

“And he shall return to his land with great riches, and his heart shall be against the holy covenant, and he shall do, and return to his own land” (ver. 28).

The statement can refer to nothing else than the close of Antiochus' first campaign. The siege of Alexandria, within whose walls Physcon and Cleopatra were then shut up, did not progress to the satisfaction of Antiochus. Physcon and Cleopatra sent a pressing embassy to Rome, and the appearance and speech of the Egyptian ambassadors before the Senate produced no little effect. Although not yet free from their Macedonian campaign, the Romans lost no time in sending ambassadors to Egypt to warn Antiochus.

Antiochus, induced by circumstances to revisit his own dominions, made a virtue of necessity, and retired from Egypt before the actual arrival of the Roman embassy (Livy, lib. xlv. 11).

The state of affairs in Judæa at that time demanded Antiochus' earnest attention. According to Josephus (*Antiq.* xii. 5), Jesus or Jason did not become high priest until after the death of Onias III. But, according to 2 Macc. iv., Onias was deposed by Antiochus through the artifices of his brother Jason shortly after Antiochus' accession. Jason offered the king a large sum of money for the position, and offered to build a Greek gymnasium in Jerusalem, in order to train up the young Jews to the observance of the Greek exercises and the Greek religion. The apostasy of the Jews which took place in consequence of that base surrender is vividly described in 2 Macc. iv. The change of religion was introduced among the Jews at first from within, and was not forced upon them from without. The weak Onias, if not privy to the attempt against the Jewish faith, does not appear to have possessed a martyr spirit. He resigned the high priesthood in terror of the rising storm, and retired to Antioch.

Jason, however, was soon circumvented by another person as base as himself. Another Onias offered a higher price for the position, and was appointed high priest by Antiochus. According to Josephus, that renegade was a younger brother both of Onias III. and of Jason; but, according to the author of 2 Macc., he was a brother of Simon, a subordinate priest, and an enemy to Onias III. The relation in which the wretch stood to the two preceding high priests need not here be discussed. He had apostatised from the true faith of Israel, and changed his name to Menelaus. Dispatched by Jason to Antiochus Epiphanes, to pay over to that monarch the promised subsidy, he availed himself of the opportunity of making the king's acquaintance, flattered the avaricious monarch, and secured the high priesthood for himself by

the additional offer of 300 talents of silver. He returned without delay to Jerusalem, probably accompanied by a military escort, bearing the royal mandate which deposed Jason from the high priesthood.

Jason was obliged to flee, and escaped into the country of the Ammonites. Menelaus assumed the high office, but was aroused to fury by the reproofs of Onias III., who was indignant at the base manner in which Menelaus made away with vessels of gold which belonged to the Temple. Onias seems to have protested against that robbery. Menelaus, afraid that Onias might yet be restored to the high priesthood, induced Andronicus, one of the Syrian nobles who had been an accomplice in the robbery of the Temple, to put Onias to death. The legal high priest of Israel was accordingly assassinated by Andronicus in a heathen sanctuary at Daphne, whither he had fled for refuge.

When Antiochus learned the circumstances of the murder, he caused Andronicus to be stripped of his purple robe and led to execution. Menelaus, according to 2 Macc., was almost deposed from office by the king because of the robbery of the Temple. But by means of heavy bribes paid over to a friend of Antiochus, Menelaus escaped for a time the doom he merited. Meanwhile Antiochus proceeded on his Egyptian campaign. Towards the close of that campaign a rumour spread throughout Judæa that the king had died in Egypt. Jason, the ejected high priest, ventured to return from the land of the Ammonites, and at the head of a thousand armed men suddenly entered Jerusalem, murdered a large number of the partisans of Menelaus, who escaped into the castle, and again assumed high-priestly functions.

The profane historians give a vivid picture of these

events. They are entirely passed over in this chapter. The campaign of Antiochus did not redound to his credit. The Romans, freed from the great anxieties caused by the war with Perseus, were not willing tamely to submit to the king of Syria overrunning the kingdom of Egypt. The kings of Egypt (Philometor and Physcon) were, indeed, forced to retire before the superior forces of Antiochus, and obliged once more to throw themselves into the strong fortress of Alexandria. But they appealed to Rome, having in vain endeavoured to obtain honourable terms of peace from Antiochus. The Roman ambassadors appeared on the scene when Antiochus Epiphanes was four miles distant from Alexandria. Popilius, who had been a friend of Antiochus at Rome, was saluted courteously by the king, who extended to him his right hand. Popilius refused to accept the proffered hand until he knew whether he could salute Antiochus as a friend, or be forced to regard him as an enemy. He therefore handed the king the tablets which contained the decree of the Roman Senate. Having read the latter, Antiochus expressed his intention of carefully considering the matter. Popilius, with a stick in his hand, at once drew a circle in the sand round the monarch, and required the king, ere he stepped outside the limits of that circle, to give an answer to the demands of Rome. Antiochus, knowing the hopelessness of a war with Rome, promised to comply with the instructions of the Senate. He was then warmly saluted by Popilius as an ally and friend of himself and of Rome. Deeply humiliated, and enraged at the affront which he dared not resent, Antiochus withdrew his army at once from Egypt, and, burning with rage, marched towards Palestine, which he determined once for all completely to subject to

his will. "The ships of Kittim," the Roman fleet from the shores of the Mediterranean, had come against him, and he was grieved, and obliged to return to his own land (ver. 30).

Considerable variety of opinion exists as to the exact number of Antiochus' campaigns against Egypt. We may pass over for the present the questions relative to the campaign spoken of in the closing six verses of this chapter. Many scholars consider that Antiochus undertook three such expeditions. This is the view of Behrmann, who thinks that the second campaign was passed over by Daniel because it had no bearing on Jewish affairs. Hofmann and Grätz (in *Gesch. der Juden*, vol. ii. suppl. n. 16) maintain that there were two campaigns only.¹

Whatever differences may exist on that point, it is clear that Daniel records only two campaigns. At the close of the first, Antiochus returned to his land "with great substance"; while the second was put an end to by the menaces of Popilius Laenas.

On Antiochus' return after the first expedition to Egypt (verses 22-27), that king took a fearful revenge on the Jewish people for their expulsion of Menelaus, the high priest whom he had set up at Jerusalem. Hundreds, if not thousands, of Jews were butchered in the streets of Jerusalem in cold blood by the Syrian

¹ 1 Macc. i. 20 is supposed by some to refer to a second campaign in B.C. 170, depicted in Dan. xi. 25-27, and that Antiochus pillaged the Temple on his way back from that expedition. This is, however, doubtful. It is, however, of little importance, as far as Dan. xi. is concerned, whether Antiochus' victory at Pelusium, with the conquest of Lower Egypt, the temporary alliance with Philometor, the setting up Physcon as king, the siege of Alexandria, and the first Roman embassy, were incidents connected with one or two campaigns.

soldiery. Accompanied by a large body of troops, and escorted by Menelaus, the renegade high priest, Antiochus entered the Temple, sacrilegiously entering even the Holy of Holies. The Temple treasury was rifled, the golden altar of incense, the candlestick, the table of shewbread, and the vessels of gold and silver were carried away. Those acts of profanation were rightly viewed as Divine judgments on the priests and people of Israel on account of their apostasy from Jehovah.

On the assumption that the Book of Daniel in general, and the last chapters in particular, were composed somewhere about B.C. 164, before the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, it is difficult to explain why the first profanation of the Temple should be merely glanced at in the clause, "*his heart shall be against the holy covenant, and he shall do, and return to his own land*" (ver. 28).

That first profanation of the Temple does not seem to have been undertaken merely for the sake of plunder. It was an act of revenge, and a daring insult to the religion of Jehovah. The entrance of Antiochus Epiphanes into the Holy of Holies had, moreover, far-reaching consequences. These have been pointed out by Grätz.¹ The fables of a statue of Moses having stood in the Holy of Holies, of the head of an ass being preserved there, with the more cruel calumny (still believed by ignorant Christians) of human sacrifices forming at least an *occasional* feature in Jewish ritual, can all, according to Grätz, be traced back to that memorable act of desecration. Dan. xi., however, contains a short but striking account of the second more scandalous profanation of the Temple, which took place in B.C. 168. The actor in the later tragedy was Apol-

¹ See his article in the *Monatsschrift des Judenthums* for 1872, entitled "Eselskultus und der Lieblosigkeit gegen Andersgläubige."

lonius, the chief collector of tribute, who no doubt carried out faithfully the wishes of his master. It was then that the idol image and altar were set up within the sacred precincts.

No allusion, however, is made in ch. xi., or in ch. xii., to the cleansing of the sanctuary. The omission is most strange, and is the more remarkable because a cleansing of the sanctuary is spoken of in Dan. viii. 14, where a date is assigned at which that "cleansing" was to take place.

The second profanation of the Temple is described in ver. 31, which is translated in the R.V.: "*And arms shall stand on his part*¹ (i.e. the armies sent forth by Antiochus for the subjugation of Judæa shall prevail), *and they* (the forces in question) *shall profane the sanctuary, even the fortress* (the words are in apposition; hence the rendering of the A.V., "the sanctuary of strength," is incorrect), *and shall take away the continual burnt-offering* (the morning and evening lamb, Num. xxviii.), *and they shall set up the abomination that maketh desolate.*"

The second desecration of the Temple is recorded by three historians, namely, by the writers of 1 and 2 Maccabees, and by Josephus. The altar of Jehovah was then polluted, and swine were sacrificed upon it. A statue of Jupiter may also have been then set up. Jerome interprets the Hebrew phrase by *abominandum idolum*, and the explanation has been generally accepted by most critics. It should, however, be noted that not one of the three writers mentions the erection of an idol statue, although two of them (2 Macc. and Josephus) record the fact that the Temple was re-named after Jupiter.

¹ See *Critical Commentary*.

The explanation of the Hebrew phrase by the Greek "abomination of desolation" is endorsed in the New Testament. A new interpretation has, however, recently been proposed by Nestle in the *Zeitschrift für A.T. Wissenschaft*, 1884.

Nestle maintains that the Hebrew "*desolating abomination*" is only a Jewish caricature of "*Lord of Heaven*," which is a Semitic equivalent of the Greek Zeus. That scholar states that, after this idea had suggested itself to his mind, he was surprised to find in the Syriac version of 2 Macc. vi. 2 that the phrase "*Lord of Heaven*" is the translation actually given for the Greek "*Olympian Jove*" ($\Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ Ὀλυμπίου). Nestle does not imagine that the text of Daniel has been altered, but he considers that the Hebrew expression found in Daniel is a disfigurement of the phrase used for the heathen Jupiter in Phœnician and Aramaic inscriptions. The suggestion is of little importance in its bearing on the passages in chs. xi. and xii. It has, however, an important bearing upon the interpretation of ch. ix., and of the N.T. reference to that passage. Hence we reject the conjecture, however ingenious it may be. The histories already mentioned are sufficient to prove that the designation referred to the erection of the altar of Jupiter as the consummation of apostasy, and not to any particular idol statue. The evidence afforded by the LXX. and Theodotion is to the same effect.

The two profanations of the Temple already mentioned, together with the atrocious massacres which took place on both occasions in the streets of Jerusalem, were sufficient to goad the Jews to madness. Those acts were, however, followed by royal edicts which enjoined religious uniformity throughout the kingdom. The people everywhere were commanded to worship the god Jupiter.

Those royal edicts aroused at last the slumbering conscience of the Jewish nation. According to 2 Macc., the edicts were enforced even in the case of the Jews who resided in the Syrian capital, and in other provinces of the kingdom far removed from Palestine.

A noble army of martyrs and confessors suddenly sprang up throughout the kingdom. Jewish men and women willing to brave death and torture in defence of their holy religion at once presented themselves. The adversaries of Israel, and the Jewish apostates from the Jewish religion, in vain vented their wrath against all that was holy. They exhibited a mad hatred against the sacred books of the Law, which were everywhere rent in pieces and consumed in the flames. The possession of any of "the Books of the Covenant" exposed the holder to punishment.

But the more eagerly the heathen strove to destroy the sacred books, the more were those books prized. Daniel speaks of the teachers who arose in that evil day to instruct the people, and who fell in the discharge of such faithful teaching "by sword, by flame, and by captivity during many days" (ver. 33). Those teachers carried on their work, no doubt, even from the very beginning of that time of reproof and blasphemy. The work of instruction was carried on throughout the villages and cities of Palestine. It is not once mentioned in the Books of the Maccabees. The teachers, however, came first, and the warriors followed after. Religious instruction permeated the ranks of the people, and then men and women who knew their God were prepared by that knowledge for the performance of exploits (ver. 32). The death of the teachers, far from terrifying their disciples, tended to refine and purify their ranks.

It is not a little remarkable that a prophet, in anticipation of such a period, should single out for special mention the efforts of the *teachers*, while the chroniclers of the period call attention only to the struggles on the battle-field.

If, however, such a book as that of Daniel were composed in the midst of such a religious war, and at the moment when success began to crown the efforts of the patriotic and religious party, it is strange that the only reference to facts connected with that outburst of religious zeal should be those contained in the following sentences : “ *The people that know their God shall be strong and do* ” (ver. 32), and “ *When they (the teachers) shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help, but many shall join themselves unto them with flatteries* ” (ver. 34).

“ *The little help* ” is generally explained of the resistance made to the edict of Antiochus by Mattathias and his five sons. That resistance led to a guerilla warfare of considerable extent and importance, during which the Maccabean chieftains were assisted by numerous bands of the Chasidim, the so-called “ *Assidæans* ” of 1 Maccabees. Those Puritan warriors ensconced themselves in mountain fastnesses, from whence they issued in order to destroy idolatrous shrines erected throughout the country, and to put to death faithless Jews who conformed to the royal edict, and were guilty of sacrificing to other gods than Jehovah. The martyrdom of Eleazar (2 Macc. vi.) and of the mother with her seven sons (recorded in 2 Macc. vii. and elsewhere), are events not alluded to in this chapter, because, as Grätz has pointed out, those martyrdoms took place at the royal residence at Antioch. The death of the aged Mattathias occurred about a year after the setting up of “ *the abomination that maketh desolate* ” in the sanctuary of Jehovah. After his death, Judas

Maccabeus assumed command of the insurgents. His first victory was gained over Apollonius, who was slain by Judas, and whose sword Judas used in all his subsequent battles. That was the first important success over the Syrian troops and their auxiliaries. The next battle, fought near Beth-horon, won over Seron, general of the army of Cœlo-Syria, was of greater importance. It was soon followed by the great battle of Emmaus, in which Judas displayed remarkable strategy. Ere the battle opened, Eleazar, Judas' brother, hastily read a portion of the holy book, and with the watchword, "The help of God," as a battle-cry, Judas and his army charged upon the foe (2 Macc. viii. 23). In spite of the disparity in numbers and weapons, victory declared itself on the side of Israel. According to 1 Maccabees, the Jewish forces numbered 3000, while the army of Nicanor and Gorgias was 47,000. The numbers given in 2 Macc. viii. are very different, being 6000 and 20,000 respectively. The battle of Bethsura took place in the following year, when Lysias, Antiochus' chief general, in command of 65,000 picked troops, was signally defeated. The opposing army led by Judas only numbered 10,000. The latter victory resulted in the capture of Jerusalem, with the exception of the citadel; and the sanctuary was cleansed and rededicated in B.C. 165.

As "the cleansing of the sanctuary" is alluded to in Dan. viii., it is quite inexplicable that such an event could have been passed over in silence in ch. xi., and the series of victories just recounted could be styled "a little help." If the "little help" refers, as Bevan and others maintain, only to the first successes of the party of the pious, led by Mattathias, then the writer, though acquainted with the fact of the "cleansing of the sanctuary," entirely

ignored the great battles which preceded that "crowning mercy." The remarkable omission has not been accounted for by the commentators of the modern school. In fact, the explanation of the chapter given by Porphyry, and adopted in the main by modern critics, creates greater difficulties than those which it was intended to solve.

With regard to the description of the king in verses 36-40, we agree with the modern critics in maintaining that it is impossible that the section can refer to any other than Antiochus Epiphanes. To break off a prophetic narrative in the midst of a description of days of trial without any reference to the judgment meted out to the oppressor would be absolutely without a parallel in Hebrew prophecy.

Antiochus Epiphanes is described in ver. 36 as doing according to his will,¹ exalting and magnifying himself above every god. This does not mean that Antiochus Epiphanes was to pretend himself to be, in the full sense of the expression, the supreme and immortal God. Language similar, and even stronger, was used by Ezekiel in his denunciation of the prince of Tyre (Ezek. xxviii. 2). But the city of Tyre is well known to have been a pro-

¹ It may be well to note that *ועשה* is rendered in the R. V., ch. viii. 12 and 24, by "do *his pleasure*," the words italicised not being in the Hebrew. Similarly ch. xi. 18, 28, 30. The fuller phrase *עשה כרצונו* "did according to his will," is used of Alexander the Great in ch. xi. 3. It is also employed in ver. 16 of Antiochus the Great. Hence the phrase is not a peculiar characteristic of the king spoken of in ver. 36, who has often been termed "the wilful king." If that title be used as a characteristic peculiar to that king it is grossly incorrect. But if that fact be borne in mind, the title may for convenience be retained. The king described in that and following verses is none other than Antiochus Epiphanes, or rather Antiochus Epiphanes together with his two immediate successors who fought against Israel, namely, Antiochus Eupator and Demetrius.

minent stronghold of idolatry of all sorts. Antiochus II. of Syria was neither the first nor the last monarch who assumed the title of Theos (*God*). Heathen monarchs, fully conscious that they were themselves mortals, were wont to claim to be in some manner impersonations of the Deity. Blasphemous speeches, like that of Nebuchadnezzar to the Hebrew confessors, were not uncommon. The Assyrians were unable to understand how a king like Hezekiah, noted for piety, could destroy all the altars erected to Jehovah throughout the kingdom of Judah, and command his people to offer sacrifices on one altar in Jerusalem (2 Kings xviii. 22). On the other hand, the Hebrew prophets regarded a king who, to gratify some personal whim, commanded his people to change their gods, though they were no gods (Jer. ii. 11 ff.), as in truth magnifying himself above every god. The edict of Antiochus was a startling one. It was specially directed against the worship of Jehovah. Such daring impiety, surpassing that of the Assyrians of old, could only be permitted until—in Isaiah’s remarkable phraseology (Isa. x. 25) quoted here by Daniel (in ver. 36)—“the indignation,” *i.e.* that of Jehovah against His people because of their sin, “be accomplished.”

Antiochus Epiphanes was an enthusiastic supporter of the worship of Jupiter Capitolinus. In order to honour that god, under the name of Zeus Olympius, he commenced a magnificent temple, finished centuries later by the Roman emperor Hadrian. Later, he indeed went further; and to increase his dignity, and to arouse the greater loyalty of his subjects, he had himself set forth as “an effulgence in human form of the Divine, a god manifest in flesh,” as Mr E. R. Bevan terms it. The god-king became a fixed object of worship. Statues and

altars were erected in his honour. Antiochus had, moreover, in view a more sordid object. Once he was acknowledged to be the impersonation of the god or gods, the treasures belonging to the temples of the gods really belonged to him, and Antiochus accordingly, when convenient, sought to appropriate those treasures for his own use and that of the kingdom.

It is not necessary to suppose that Antiochus (in ver. 37) exhibited any special contempt for "the gods of his fathers." He lived long enough in Rome to have imbibed some predilection for the religious worship there practised. Desirous as he was of reviving the glories of the Syrian monarchy, he may have imagined that the religious rites of the West had an influence in the formation of the warlike spirit of the Romans. He thoroughly grasped the idea, which was then a novel one, that unity in religion tends to strengthen a kingdom. It is not strange that he had no conception of the difficulty of subjugating the minds and consciences of men. He probably despised the Jews as slaves who submitted quietly to every change of masters, while the base apostasy of the Hellenistic party led him to imagine that the Jewish people could easily be driven to accept a new religion. Those anticipations were doomed to be gloriously disappointed.

From the religious point of view, such conduct is correctly characterised by Daniel as "magnifying himself over every god." Pretending to be himself an impersonation of Deity, Antiochus was competent to decide what gods were to be adored and what were not, and thus he was virtually "exalted above all gods." But the Roman historian also was correct in making the apparently opposite statement: "*In duabus tamen magnis honestisque rebus vere regius erat animus, in urbium donis et deorum cultu.*"

It is now generally asserted that "*the desire of women,*" mentioned in ver. 37, "must, according to the context, be some object of worship." The LXX. translation, however, knows nothing of such a god or goddess. The Books of the Maccabees and the history of Josephus do not speak of any divinity patronised by Antiochus Epiphanes which was especially honoured by women. For a considerable time Ephraim Syrus' interpretation was adopted by critics, namely, that the goddess Nanaia is referred to; in the attempt to plunder whose temple Antiochus was stated by some authorities to have met his doom. The interpretation has, however, been generally abandoned. For there is no reason why the goddess Nanaia should be thus designated; and, moreover, according to the best critics, the prophecy must have been written prior to the death of Antiochus. Hence the view of Ewald has been accepted by many modern critics, namely, that the passage refers to Tammuz or Adonis, a divinity specially patronised by the women of Syria.

It deserves, however, careful consideration, whether there may not be a distinct reference in the expression to the Messiah. This is the view upheld by G. S. Faber in the *Sacred Calendar of Prophecy*, vol. ii. 164-169. The eyes of the women of Israel were directed more or less to the great hope of the nation; and in seeking to root out the Jewish religion, Antiochus Epiphanes was verily warring against the Lord's Christ. It was with a similar object that Pekah and Remaliah sought to set up in Ahaz's days a new line of monarchs in Jerusalem, and strove to place the son of Tabeal, an unknown individual, upon David's throne (Isa. vii.). Faber supposes the passage to refer to the future; in our opinion it must be

explained of the past. Professor Samuel Lee of Cambridge expressed himself in favour of this opinion in his work on *Eusebius' Theophania*.

But there is no historical evidence in favour of any such interpretation. The context, though somewhat in favour of the phrase indicating an object of worship, is by no means decisive. The genitive in the compound expression may be understood either objectively or subjectively. In the latter case it may be explained to refer to *husbands* or *children*. The historians of the period record that the dearest feelings of women as regards their husbands and children were ruthlessly disregarded by the Syrian tyrant. The objective interpretation of the phrase may be, indeed, definitely set aside. Antiochus exhibited no contempt for the female sex. He had not only several wives, but even concubines, upon one of whom he bestowed as a royal gift two cities, Tarsus and Mallos; and it is recorded that those cities rose in insurrection against him because of the gross affront thus offered to their dignity (2 Macc. iv. 30).

Verse 38 is thus rendered in the R.V.: "*But in his place (marg. "office") shall he honour the god of fortresses; and a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honour with gold, and silver, and with precious stones and pleasant things.*" The verse, considered apart from the context, presents no difficulty. "*The god of fortresses*" spoken of would be no unsuitable designation of Jupiter Capitolinus, who was raised by Antiochus to the position of patron-god of the kingdom. The reading of the LXX. in the Chigi MS. affords no sense. They omit the expression "*god of fortresses,*" and have only "*and to his place shall he remove.*" Jerome states that the LXX. translate the passage, "*and he shall remove a strong god to his place.*" If that be the

correct reading of the LXX., it may refer to a dedication festival in honour of Jupiter, at which the king caused the statue of the god to be enthroned in a national sanctuary. In that case the Hebrew phrase¹ should be rendered "*upon his pedestal*," the pedestal being the throne of the idol. Gesenius' translation of the Hebrew is more commonly adopted, viz. "*instead thereof*," the suffix being explained to refer to לְבַיִת in the verse previous. In favour of the latter translation it should be remembered that the phrase used is used in that sense in verses 20 and 21. In that case the verse merely reaffirms what has been mentioned in ver. 37, namely, that the worship of "*the god of fortresses*" would be substituted for the deities formerly worshipped by the Syrians.

Hitzig, however, is dissatisfied with the translation "*god of fortresses*," and conjectures that "*fortresses*" ought to be read "*sea-fortress*," which would be a possible reading of the unpointed text.² The same expression, "*the fortress of the sea*," with the article, is used in Isa. xxiii. 4 in reference to Tyre.³ In 2 Macc. iv. 18-20, it is said that Antiochus attended the games celebrated at Tyre in honour of Hercules or Melkart; and consequently he must have sacrificed on that occasion to that god. Hitzig's conjecture has, therefore, much in its favour, on the assumption that Dan. xi. is a chronicle written after the events. Hitzig considers the text represents Antiochus as worshipping "*the god of the sea-fortresses*" in addition to "*the strange god*" whom his

¹ עַל בְּנֵי.

² That is, מְצֻדָּה would be divided into מְצֻדָּה.

³ E. R. Bevan (*House of Seleucus*, ii. 150, footnote) suggests that it may have been the goddess Roma in connection with Jupiter—the goddess having, of course, as an emblem a mural crown. But that is pure imagination.

fathers had not worshipped. Although, therefore, the words of the verse are simple, their meaning is far from clear. Professor Bevan thinks "the obscurity of the passage may be due to the fact that the author is alluding to some report current among the Jews, but which, perhaps, had little real foundation." What the "report" alluded to here by Professor Bevan may have been is unknown to us.

Ver. 39, however, is darker still, and Professor Bevan appears to be correct in considering the Hebrew of that verse almost unintelligible. The R.V. has made an effort to render into intelligible English what is by no means clear in the original. "*And he shall deal with the strongest fortresses by the help of a strange god.*" It is somewhat strained to translate the Hebrew "*and he shall do to*" in the sense of "*he shall deal with,*" signifying he shall *take* or *destroy*. The phrase is employed in that sense in Deut. xxxiv. 4, Isa. x. 11, etc. But in all those instances the second part of the sentence explains what is done, and no such explanation is afforded in this verse. The Hebrew phrase may mean "*with the help of a strange god,*" after the analogy of 1 Sam. xiv. 45, where it is said of Jonathan, "*for with the help of God he wrought this day.*" Such a rendering in this passage is, however, peculiarly objectionable. Is it possible for a Hebrew prophet to speak of a king overturning fortresses "by the help of a strange god"? Bertholdt's rendering, which connects the first part of this verse with the preceding verse, may well be pronounced impossible. It is: "*And he will place* (the precious things mentioned in ver. 38) *in the temple of the god of war.*" Ewald's translation is not much better: "*He acts* (or, deals with) *with the strong fortresses as with the strange god,*" i.e. he shall show as much love to

the fortresses as to the god. These and other attempts to extract some sense out of the passage tend to show that the text is hopelessly corrupt. Hitzig's conjecture is therefore plausible, and has been adopted by Bevan and Kautzsch. He slightly alters the punctuation, and extracts the sense, "*He shall procure for the strong fortresses the people of a strange god,*" i.e. "He shall plant heathen colonists in the fortresses of Judæa." According to 1 Macc. iii. 6, Antiochus purposed to "place strangers in all their (the Jews') quarters, and divide their land by lot." But that plan was not determined on by Antiochus until Judas Maccabeus had gained his great victories prior to the cleansing of the sanctuary, before which event Bevan and other critics believe the Book of Daniel was composed.

These modern attempts to correct the text of Daniel so as to bring it into closer harmony with the records of Maccabean times are, however, highly suspicious. If the Patristic, mediæval, and post-Reformation writers have twisted sentences of Daniel to make them express the meaning those commentators desired them to convey, all such writers have been far outdone in that particular point by modern critics.

Equally unsatisfactory are the attempts of some of the so-called orthodox commentators to evade the difficulties presented in the traditional text. Keil may be adduced as a notable instance, the more remarkable because he has done excellent service in the field of exegesis. That scholar maintains that the prophecy is literal, and depicts the Antichrist of the last days. Keil could not shut his eyes to the fact that it is difficult on such an hypothesis to reconcile the first portion of the description of "the wilful king," in which he is depicted as a kind of infidel,

claiming superiority over all the powers of heaven and earth, with the second portion, in which that king is represented as worshipping a strange god, the god of fortresses, and honouring that god with all manner of costly gifts. Dissatisfied with the attempts made by Kliefoth to evade that difficulty, Keil hit upon the novel idea that "the strange god," the "god of fortresses," was not a god at all, but the personification of war. Thus he makes Daniel guilty of the absurdity of writing that "the wilful king" would worship as god "the conquest of fortresses." Keil further expounds the statement that that king should overcome the strongest fortresses by the help of a strange god, to mean that he will be able to reduce those fortresses by war! Such interpretations can only be regarded as curiosities of exegesis. Such difficulties, however, tend to prove that the prophecy itself, of which we believe this portion is a Targumic paraphrase, is not a *vaticinium post eventum*.

It ought to be carefully noted that Israel did not obtain a decisive victory over the Syro-Greek monarchy in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. The death of that monarch also brought but little relief to the nation. The religion of Jehovah was not indeed stamped out in Palestine, as Antiochus had fondly expected. Those whom that monarch had treated as a mere sect who could be easily trodden under foot had gained important successes over the trained Syro-Greek soldiers. But the victories of Judas Maccabeus were to some extent only victories of a guerilla type of warfare, important chiefly as affording hopes of something more important. Such was the battle of Beth-horon, in which Judas was so fortunate as to slay with his own hand the leader Apollonius. The victory over Gorgias at Ashdod or Azotus was mainly owing

to the indiscretion exhibited by that commander. The victory over Lysias at Bethsura is spoken of in 1 Macc. iv. 28-35 as a most remarkable victory. Judas is said to have overcome with 10,000 Lysias with 65,000. E. R. Bevan does not, however, consider that the victory possessed the importance ascribed to it by the Jewish historian. It is perhaps possible that Lysias did not on that occasion put all his troops into the field. The honours of the day fell, indeed, to the side of Judas, who, according to 1 Macc. iv., at once marched up against Jerusalem, took the city, cleansed the Temple, and rededicated the sanctuary. The writer of 1 Macc. does not mention the fact that the citadel still remained in the hands of the heathen. Lysias seems at that time to have heard of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, and it was necessary for a while to cease active operations against the nationalist party.

It appears, however, from 2 Macc. that the cleansing of the Temple took place at a somewhat later period, and that negotiations with Judas Maccabeus were actually opened up on this occasion. The accounts of 1 Macc. and 2 Macc. are by no means in harmony, and what actually took place is uncertain. The documents cited in 2 Macc. xi. 16-36 seem to have been tampered with to a considerable degree, and it is likely that the first overtures for peace came from the council of the new monarch, the boy-king Antiochus Eupator. The rescripts, however, mentioned in 2 Macc., whatever their precise form may have been, were, as E. R. Bevan maintains, the close of the first part of the great struggle by which for a time the free exercise of the Jewish religion was secured. But the demands of the insurgents were not satisfied with that concession. After a short interval the war between the two parties was resumed and carried on with

vigour, the struggle having assumed the character of a war for national liberty rather than that of a war for religious freedom.¹

In fact, it is a mistake to suppose that the oppression of the Jews lasted only during the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. The oppression lasted during somewhat over thirty years, from the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes in B.C. 176 or 175, all through the short reign of Antiochus Eupator, during which the Syro-Greeks recovered much of the ground they had formerly lost, and almost to the end of the reign of Demetrius Soter. Those three heathen monarchs were the "three shepherds" or rulers who, having exhibited their evil character as hostile to the people and the Law of God, were "cut off" by Divine justice, according to the prophecy of Zechariah (ch. xi. 8), during the prophetic "month" or thirty years, because they were guilty of devouring the flock which, as "shepherds of the people," they should have fed.²

It was within the portion of the period which followed the death of Antiochus Epiphanes that the great battle was fought (B.C. 163) between Lysias and Judas Maccabeus at Bethsura, in which Eleazar, Judas' brother, fell, and Judas had much difficulty in effecting a retreat from the victorious Syro-Greeks.

The battle of Adasa, fought (B.C. 161) some two years later, when Nicanor was defeated and slain, was some compensation for the defeat at Bethsura. But the rapid march of Bacchides, and his victory at Eleasa, where Judas Maccabeus himself fell on the field of battle, bid fair to be

¹ See E. R. Bevan's *House of Seleucus*, vol. ii. and Appendix, and B. Niese's work, *Kritik der beiden Makkäber nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte der makkabäischen Erhebung* (Berlin, 1900).

² See *Bampton Lectures on Zechariah*, pp. 312-317.

the ruin of the nationalist cause. Jonathan and Simon, after three or four dark years, during which Palestine was secured by Syrian fortresses, came again into power ; and received in 152 at last, as "the gift of a heathen king," the position of high priest and prince.¹ That position, however, was not really secure till Alexander Balas ascended the throne of Syria, Demetrius having been defeated and slain. The last trace of Syrian supremacy was not removed till the citadel of Jerusalem was surrendered to Simon and cleansed from its pollutions about B.C. 141 (1 Macc. xiii. 49-52).²

¹ See 1 Macc. xi. 26, 57-58, xiii. 36-42, xiv. 38-41.

² See E. R. Bevan, *House of Seleucus*, vol. ii. pp. 216-7.

CHAPTER X

THE LAST VISION OF DANIEL (*continued*)
(CH. XI. 40 TO END OF CH. XII.)

The Contest and Final Victory

IT would at first sight appear natural to regard the section of the Last Vision of Daniel which commences with ver. 40 as a continuation of the preceding prophecy. Porphyry fell into that awkward mistake. Having found, in his opinion, the chronicle of the previous part of the chapter generally correct in the historical facts which it delineated, he attempted also to expound of Antiochus Epiphanes' reign ver. 40 to the end. He therefore regarded those verses as having reference to a new campaign carried on by Antiochus Epiphanes against Egypt. The Greek and Roman historians of the period, however, make no mention of any such campaign, and it is impossible that such could have taken place after Rome's intervention in favour of Egypt. Antiochus Epiphanes had been effectually debarred from any further attacks on Egypt by the bold attitude of the Roman Senate, which, by the annexation of Macedonia to the Roman dominions, had already virtually, though not formally, overthrown the Greek empire. The passage in question appears to us to form part of the original prophecy copied out without any

paraphrase or interpretation. It describes the final overthrow of the Greek power as taking place upon the mountains of Israel. The independence of the Jewish kingdom was the final blow given to Greek sovereignty in that quarter.

The advance of the Syro-Greek invader, as he swooped down upon Palestine and Egypt, is graphically described in ver. 40 to have been like a whirlwind which sweeps all before it. The words of Isaiah, "He shall overflow and pass through," are again made use of by Daniel. The armament of the great king of the north is represented as duly furnished with chariots and horsemen, and supported by many ships. Not a word, however, is said about elephants, which then formed such an important part of the Syro-Greek forces. That omission would have been impossible in a prophecy written after the events had taken place, but one quite possible in a paraphrase or Targum. The Greek invader is described as conquering all the countries against which his army advances. Without meeting any real opposition, the foes march into "the glorious land." The lands which were occupied by the nations hostile to the Jews, such as the Edomites, the Moabites, and the Ammonites, are represented as spared. Egypt, however, does not escape subjection. That country is represented as the final goal of the invader. The treasures of Egypt fall a prey into his hands, and the very Libyans and Ethiopians (mentioned 2 Chron. xii. 3, xvi. 8; compare also Nah. iii. 9), as powerful auxiliaries of Egypt, yield submission to the new invader, and swell the ranks of his army. On the mountains of Israel, while in the plenitude of his power, the mighty conqueror comes to his end, and none can help him.

The modern critics admit that the events depicted from ver. 40 to the end did not really take place. The fact seems to have been that Antiochus, prevented by Roman interference from grasping the riches of Egypt, which once seemed to be almost in his hands, was sorely pressed for the money needed for the thorough conquest of Judæa, and for the other ambitious schemes which he had devised. As he claimed, however, to be an incarnation of the Divinity, he imagined himself entitled to seize hold of all the treasures laid up in divers temples. Such a practical assertion of Divinity was more than his subjects were prepared to submit to. When he was engaged in robbing a temple, as noticed before, his career was cut short by death. It is very possible, as already noticed, that Antiochus Epiphanes may have begun to consider that he had acted unwisely in his mad attack upon the religion of the Jews, and, having had bitter experience of Jewish prowess on the field of battle, may have thought it wiser to seek to conciliate their favour. His repentance, if it ever took place, came however, too late. The accounts given of his death in 1 Macc. vi. 9-13 and 2 Macc. ix. 2-27 do not, indeed, agree together. But what is tolerably clear is that he died, probably at Tabæ in Persia, on his way back to Babylon in the year B.C. 164. The modern critics, who assign the composition of the Book of Daniel to B.C. 164, suppose the book to have been written prior to the death of Antiochus, and even before the rededication of the Temple, which is not mentioned in the prophecy. Driver, the most moderate of those critics, regards it as written during the time of the bitterest persecution of the Jews.

On the whole, we agree with the modern critics on the

following points :—(1) Verses 40–43 cannot be regarded as a prophecy of events which are yet to be fulfilled. The difficulties in the way of that interpretation increase, the more closely the verses are examined together with their context. (2) The idea put forward by Porphyry, that those closing verses describe a campaign of Antiochus Epiphanes against Egypt, undertaken at the close of his career, is opposed to the facts of history. Porphyry's statements respecting that imaginary campaign have been simply founded upon these verses of Daniel, and are derived from no other authority.

On the other hand, those closing verses cannot fairly be viewed as the writer's expectations or guesses with regard to the downfall of Antiochus Epiphanes, which was then future. Those expectations, if interpreted in the way they have been by modern critics, were completely falsified by the events.

The fact appears to be that no interpretation of the entire chapter can make its details harmonise with the facts of known history. Although we do not coincide with the interpretation of the vision given by Kranichfeld, that scholar's commentary on this portion of Daniel appears on the whole to be the most suggestive. The last Vision, as it lies before us in its Hebrew dress, appears to be a compound of prophecy and paraphrase. The paraphrastic portions often mention facts which tend to show that the interpreter of Daniel, whose work is deftly woven into the prophecy, lived in the early part of the Maccabean era. But alongside of those paraphrastic additions to, and explanations of, the original prophecy, there are, as already noticed, a number of sentences and short paragraphs out of harmony with their present surroundings, and which seem to have formed portions of

the original prediction. Critics have wearied themselves with the endeavour to resuscitate the views which were propounded originally by Porphyry in his assault upon Christianity. The numerous changes required by their attempt to make out the prophecy a chronicle of events which occurred in or before the writer's time are amply sufficient to discredit their conclusions.

According to our hypothesis, chs. xi. and xii. are a paraphrase of a genuine prophecy of Daniel which described in broad outlines the events affecting the Jewish people and the interests of true religion, up to the close of the third great empire, that is, the Grecian. We hold fast by the ancient and Patristic interpretation, according to which the fourth world-power is the Roman. In the form in which the last prediction of Daniel has come down to us—namely, through a Hebrew translation of an original Aramaic (a point which may here hypothetically be assumed)—several paraphrastic interpretations are embedded here and there in the prophecy. Those paraphrastic additions date from the eventful year which witnessed the death of Mattathias and the election of his son, Judas Maccabeus, to the vacant chieftainship. Anticipations of an approaching fulfilment of prophecy have often led men to submit to martyrdom and nerved them to perform extraordinary feats of valour. Jurieu's interpretation of the Book of the Revelation, which was based in great part on the writings of the great Joseph Mede, had much to do with the brave but ill-timed insurrection of the Camisards in 1702. That insurrection, fanned to a flame by a misinterpretation of the prophecies of the Apocalypse, was not suppressed until after 100,000 had fallen on the field of battle, and 10,000 had perished on the scaffold. The last two chapters of the Book of

Daniel, in which an old prophecy of Daniel, accompanied by an interpretation of its contents, is set forth, were probably one of the means whereby the slumbering energies of the persecuted Jews were awakened to action in the Maccabean era. Such a stimulus was required at that time to awaken faith, and to stir up Judah's lion for the victorious struggle. What could have been more useful in such a crisis than the exposition of an old prophecy which held forth the assurance of a speedy overthrow of the Greek tyrant, and of a day of success, when the indignation of Jehovah against His people for their sins should finally have passed away? Hence the sketch of past history, in which several of the wars between Syria and Egypt, of which that generation knew so much, are so fully detailed—a sketch which points out the close connection of the kingdoms of Syria and Egypt with the third great world-power of Greece, then tottering to its fall.

A great principle that underlies Hebrew prophecy is set forth in the Targum of Palestine, in its explanation of Jacob's ejaculatory prayer uttered after that patriarch had announced the future of the tribe of Dan (Gen. xlix. 18): "Jacob said when he beheld Gideon the son of Joash, and Samson the son of Manoah, who were to arise as deliverers: I look not to the deliverance wrought by Gideon, nor to the deliverance wrought by Samson, because the deliverance achieved by them is only a temporary deliverance; but I wait for and look to thy deliverance, O Lord, because thy deliverance is an eternal deliverance."

Agreeably to that great principle, Hebrew prophets often speak of the deliverance by Messiah when predicting deliverances which were near at hand, but which were

widely separated in time from the great days of Messiah. When the prophet Isaiah speaks in the Book of Immanuel (chs. vii.—xii.) of the deliverance of Judah from the yoke of Assyria, he predicts the advent of Messiah as the Child of the maiden; although he announces that the expected Child, on account of the sin of the house of David, would be born in humble circumstances, in a wasted country and a despoiled land (Isa. vii.), reduced from the position of a country full of noble cities to that of what might be called prairie territory. For, although in the dark days there predicted the tree of Jesse should be cut down, there would come forth a Shoot out of its stump, and a Branch out of its roots would bear fruit (Isa. xi.).

Jeremiah predicts the overthrow of the series of unrighteous kings or "shepherds" of the house of David, which long line of oppressors was to be brought finally to an end by the descent of the mighty hammer of the King of Babylon. In his predictions that prophet announces that, notwithstanding such terrible events, Israel would be restored to the land which had been given to it by God. In connection with that restoration, the prophet further speaks of the raising up unto David of the Righteous Branch who was to reign as king and do wisely (Jer. xxiii. 5). When Zechariah was instructed in the course of his great night of visions concerning the breaking up of the peace of the Persian empire, which had to take place ere Jehovah's people could be set free, among the revelations of the future then made known to him was that of "My Servant the Branch" (Zech. iii. 8-10). And when a further revelation was made to the same prophet of the mighty storm of Grecian invasion in the days of Alexander the Great, which, sweeping down

from beyond the northern parts of Syria, should extend even to the borders of Egypt, mention is made of the advent to Jerusalem in peaceful and unostentatious guise of the long-expected Messiah (Zech. ix.). At the close of that same chapter there is a prediction of the war of the sons of Zion against Greece, which was fulfilled in the events of the Maccabean struggle (Zech. ix. 13-17).¹

The grand deliverance to be brought about by Messiah is thus more or less distinctly mentioned in many cases when the prophets announce temporal deliverances which were to precede Messiah's advent. What difficulty can there be in supposing that Daniel predicted the deliverance to be wrought by Messiah in a prophecy which describes the efforts put forth by the Grecian power to root out the worship of Jehovah and to scatter the holy nation, and the utter failure of such an attempt? The part borne by the holy people in the struggle is but slightly glanced at in Dan. xi. The heroism exhibited in the Maccabean conflict is depicted in more vivid colours by Zechariah. All that is quite in accordance with the gradual unfolding of events by means of successive prophets. The sketch of the Greek period set forth in Daniel's original prophecy was no doubt shorter, and expressed in more ideal phraseology than what has come down to us in chap. xi.

The campaign depicted in the closing verses is not any particular campaign of the individual Antiochus Epiphanes, but an ideal description of efforts made by the Grecian power to gain and retain possession of Palestine and Egypt. In the Holy Land the struggle is represented as taking place between the kingdom that was of this world and the kingdom of the Most High. But, like the later

¹ See the *Bampton Lectures on Zechariah*.

description of the battle depicted in Rev. xix., notwithstanding the apparent advantages in power and might of the adversaries of Jehovah, the enemy is described as beaten and overcome. The last and final overthrow of Greece, as a world-power antagonistic to truth and to God, took place on the mountains of Judæa. That the prophet should speak of the struggle as long-continued, and as succeeded by a day in which the dead would awake from their slumbers, is exactly in accordance with Old Testament Messianic predictions. In all such prophecies the interval between the first and second advents of the Christ is left without mention.

The "vast and profound influence" which the Book of Daniel excited in the times from Antiochus Epiphanes downwards has been already noticed. It may be safely admitted that the closing prophecy of Daniel *in its present form* cannot be proved to go back to an earlier period than B.C. 164. It, however, by no means follows that such a statement is true with regard to the Book of Daniel as a whole. That the closing prophecy was considerably modified in the LXX. translation of that book is a fact of considerable importance. The LXX. translation of that book cannot be assigned to a later date than B.C. 100, and was very probably forty, or possibly fifty, years earlier. But the Book of Daniel as a whole must have been accepted long ere 1 Maccabees was written, which was between B.C. 125 and 100.

In such a historical period, when the Chasidim as a party were so powerful, and were leaders in great measure of the religious portion of the people, it is utterly impossible that a book like the Book of Daniel could have been written and accepted as genuine by the Jewish nation. A paraphrase and interpretation of a single prophecy of

Daniel might, however, easily have been accepted as a fair representation of the original.

Additional stories or legends, as in the versions of the LXX. and Theodotion, might readily in later days be appended to a book universally recognised to be genuine. These and other like considerations are sufficient to prove that the Book of Daniel as a whole, whatever solution may be suggested with regard to apparent anachronisms, must be ascribed to a far earlier date than the era of the Maccabees.

The forecast of the vision extends, however, to the end of the world's history. The prophecy of the Seventy Weeks commences from a fairly definite date and runs to the end of 490 years, to a period when the person and work of Messiah were to be revealed to those who had eyes to see and hearts to understand. That latter prophecy speaks in general terms of the unknown period beyond the days when Messiah should be rejected and His people should cease to be "His own possession."

Messiah is similarly brought upon the scene in this last prophecy of Daniel, which at the close extends to the great epoch of Christ's Second Advent. As the Last Vision gives a description of "wars and rumours of wars," so Messiah is represented as coming to the help of His people in warrior guise. The Book of the Revelation (in ch. xii.) depicts Christ as the Child of His Church, the Church of the Old Testament, and Messiah as sought for in the cradle in order to be destroyed. Rescued and caught up from the malice of the world-power to God's throne, Messiah had (in that allegory) afterwards to be represented under another guise, and Michael, with an army of angels, is brought upon the scene which portrays Messiah as the conqueror. The picture was

borrowed from Daniel xii., and may well be regarded as an interpretation of the earlier prophecy.

Michael stands up, the great prince which standeth for the children of Israel. Victory is certain when Jehovah stands up to plead for His people, and pleads against the enemy by fire and by His sword, and the slain of Jehovah are many (Isa. lxvi. 16). "There shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time, and at that time thy people shall be delivered every one that shall be found written in the book." The "time of trouble" commenced when, because of Israel's disobedience, Messiah no longer acted as their shepherd, when "the staff of beauty" was broken. And when, after that period, the three Gentile shepherds who oppressed the Lord's people were cut off, and Israel remained still impenitent (Zech. xi. 7, 8), Messiah still did not quite desert His people. He came to "the poor of the flock." He taught them on earth, and the whole nation with them. But the nation loathed Him, and when He asked for His wages as "Shepherd of Israel," they gave for His hire thirty pieces of silver. Then "the staff of bands" was also broken (Zech. xi. 14), and Israel was given up to "be filled with their own devices" (Prov. i. 31). The people were handed over to "the worthless shepherd" (Zech. xi. 15-17), the Roman power, "every man into the hands of his neighbour and into the hand of his king" (Zech. xi. 6). The darkest period of trouble for Israel was when Jerusalem fell into the hands of the Romans. "The time of trouble" for Israel has never completely come to an end since that terrible day. "The people of the prince that should come" (the Roman power) have destroyed the city and the sanctuary,

and "wars and rumours of war" will continue, with short intermissions, until "the consummation and that determined," the wrath of God, "shall be poured out upon the desolator" (Dan. ix. 27).

We have thus ventured to interweave Daniel's two great prophecies with those of Zechariah also because all those prophecies run on to the same end, when at Messiah's Second Advent "the great time of trouble" will cease, when His people, as they behold Him, will say in wondering adoration, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord!" The First Advent points to the Second, and the Second Advent of the Redeemer will be the final setting up of His eternal kingdom.

The vision itself ends with ver. 3. Daniel was there directed to close the book of his Dreams or Visions, which he had begun to put together in the first year of Belshazzar (ch. vii. 1). That book he was now directed to seal, as indicative that the revelation made to him was at an end. That revelation was to remain dark "unto the time of the end." It is not, however, meant that the book was not to be read, and not be partially comprehended. Isaiah xxix. 10-14 is most instructive on that point. There the prophet speaks of "a book" rejected by the unlearned because of assumed difficulties, and asserted to be a "sealed" book by such as were unwilling to listen to its teachings. There is no difficulty such as Professor Bevan seems to imagine is "obvious to us," though not "to the author's contemporaries."

Nor do we see the difficulty which some consider lurks in the expression, "Many shall run to and fro." Why should not that expression be used in the sense in which it is employed in Jer. v. 1, namely, of rapid movement hither and thither? Jeremiah uses it in reference to the

difficulty of seeking to find an upright man in the streets of Jerusalem, as the angels sought in vain for such in the streets of Sodom. Amos (viii. 12) employs the word in a similar sense of those who would run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord and not be able to find it. Zechariah uses it in reference to the eyes of the Lord, which run to and fro throughout the whole earth; and similarly 2 Chron. xvi. 9. Why should it not refer to the Jews or Israelites running to and fro through the world, and gradually increasing in learning the ways and works of God by their weary wanderings? By those wanderings they are even now being prepared more fully to learn the meaning of the Visions which so deeply concern them, and which so wonderfully prove the power of God who can bring good out of evil. It is only at "the time of the end" that Israel is to become, in the full sense of the words, "a people prepared for Jehovah" and His Messiah (Luke i. 17). Their actions showed that they were not so "prepared" when He came unto His own and they received Him not (John i. 11). There is, therefore, no occasion whatever to propose any alteration in the text, as is done by various critics.

The direction to close up the book came from the mighty angel described in ch. x. 5, 6, who had been throughout the spokesman with Daniel. But as the prophet lifted up his eyes he saw that there were two other angels attending upon that glorious personage. He who was especially distinguished by the peculiar glory of his appearance seemed to hover over and above the river (ver. 6; comp. viii. 16), or the Tigris, where the vision was beheld (ch. x. 4). The other two angels were seen, the one on one bank of the river, and the other on the other. The prophet heard one of those two ask the

glorious angel clothed in linen, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" Lifting up in reply his two hands to heaven, to add special emphasis and solemnity to his words, the great angel swore by Him that liveth for ever that it should be "for a time, times, and an half; and when there shall be a conclusion of the dashing in pieces the power of the holy nation all these things shall be accomplished."

Daniel heard, but understood not. The things presented to his mind were too "wonderful," the mysterious time too dark, for him then to comprehend. The "words" were to be closed and sealed till "the time of the end." That "end" was to be brought about by the standing up of Michael. Until his coming, the final 1260 mysterious days were not to be at an end.

We maintain that the special period spoken of in this verse (ver. 7) is not identical with that mentioned in ch. vii. 25. The two phrases, though they may be translated alike, are not identical. The former is in Aramaic, the one before us in Hebrew. That fact does not fully explain the difference, or warrant us to affirm their identity. They are both, too, indefinite in form. Taken together, they make up "seven times," "the times of the Gentiles," in our Lord's phraseology (Luke xxi. 24), or "the fulness of the Gentiles," as St Paul expresses it (Rom. xi. 25). The first portion of those "seven times," as here stated, closes with the breaking in pieces the power of the holy people because of their rejection of Messiah. That portion came to an end in the times that followed shortly after the ascension of Christ to His throne (Rev. xii. 5, 6). The second "time, times, and a half" (Dan. vii. 25) closes with the Second Advent. The two periods are not literal, nor are they to be interpreted precisely on the "day-year"

theory. The periods are measured not by years, but by the work accomplished during their course.¹

Those days are not "days" measured by any measure of man. They are here spoken of as elapsing after the perpetual sacrifice was taken away, and an abomination which maketh desolate was set up. Mention is afterwards made of 1290 days. That second period is longer than the time, times, and a half by thirty days, or a prophetic "month."

The transgression that maketh desolate was spoken of in ch. viii. It was followed by the taking away of "the perpetual sacrifice" offered up to the God of heaven, and the casting down of His sanctuary. The casting down of the sanctuary spoken of in that chapter was to take place in a period not so very remote from the time of Daniel, or, as explained in the vision referred to, in the latter times of the four minor kingdoms into which the Grecian power was to be divided (ch. viii. 23). The cleansing of the sanctuary in the Maccabean period is not, however, predicted in the vision of ch. viii. A greater cleansing of a nobler sanctuary was, however, intimated as to occur at the close of the "evening morning, two thousand and three hundred" (ch. viii. 14, 26). Desolation, too, on account of sin, and that sin an awful crime, was spoken of at the close of the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks, as if to occur in the near future, at the termination of the 490 fateful years (ch. ix. 27). Because of the sin darkly alluded to in the opening of that prophecy (ch. ix. 25), the wrath of God was after

¹ See the *Critical and Grammatical Commentary*, and also my *Biblical Essays*, Key to the Apocalypse, pp. 240 ff. Rev. xii. 5, 6, appears to give a key to their solution, though it does not enable us to predict the time of their conclusion.

the Seventy Weeks were ended to come upon Jerusalem "to the uttermost."

After the wrath poured upon "the Desolator" which is there predicted, that "Desolator" being himself but a battle-axe (Jer. li. 20) in the hand of Jehovah to scatter the holy people, there was to be "a month" longer of breaking down, which was to succeed the special devastation caused by him. May it not be conjectured (it must be remembered it is only conjecture) that this "month" of days is somewhat akin to the "month" spoken of by Zechariah (xi. 8), in the course of which the three evil shepherds were cut off? The "month" of Daniel appears to be the closing period in which that last and most intolerable of "shepherds,"—one not, however, included in the "three" mentioned before,—"the worthless shepherd" of Zechariah (xi. 16, 17), the fourth or Roman power, will be finally trodden under foot. "I will overturn, overturn, overturn, till he come whose right it is, and I will give it to (him)" (Ezek. xxi. 27).

The critics who have supposed these dates in Daniel to refer to Maccabean times have confessedly not been happy in their solutions. They have never been able to point out the exact three years and a half, which ought to have been so easy had the prophecy been a *vaticinium post eventum*. The "thirty days" beyond that period, if regarded as literal and not as mystical days, would terminate at a period when the war between the sons of Zion and Greece had not been brought to a close, and when victory, indeed, seemed rather to incline towards the Syro-Grecian side.

We confess ourselves to be in the dark, and the best of the modern critics have expressed themselves in a similar

dilemma, as to the meaning of the 1335 days. That the 1335 days are a period of blessing may, perhaps, be safely affirmed from the statements in the sacred text; but as to when that period is to begin, or when it is to close, and what is to occur within its limits, nothing has been revealed.¹ All we know is that at the close of that period Daniel will himself appear among the righteous dead when they all stand before God (see p. 79). What more may happen, the great future itself only can reveal.

¹ G. S. Faber ingeniously supposes that the 1335 days are the millennial period *plus* the years of the dark irruption of Gog and Magog described in Rev. xx. But, though ingenious, we cannot think the interpretation is sound. It is one of the many cases in which one may detect a lurking desire to interpret allegorical prophecies as literal predictions.

THE END

INDEX

- Abomination of desolation, 294, 240, 324.
 Aboth, Tract, 52.
 Abraham's deliverance from fire of Chaldees, 117.
 Abrahams, I., 60.
 Abydenus, 119, 120.
 Acrostics, asserted, in Ps. cx. and in Esther, 95, 96.
 Adasa, battle of, 308.
 Alexander the Great, 174 ff., 246 ff.
 Alexandre, *Lib. Sibyll.*, 72.
 Altar seldom termed "Holy of Holies," 200.
 Anderson, Sir R., 238.
 Andronicus, 289.
 Angel, the mighty, 322.
 Anointing removed, 214.
 Antichrist, 165, 166; not referred to in Dan. xi. 21, 279.
 Antiochus Epiphanes: destruction of sacred books, 53; persecutions of, 117; outlines of, indefinite, 180-1, 183-4; work in Judæa, 188; his history, 276; considered mad, 278; contemptible person, 277-9; massacre at Jerusalem, 292, 294; first Egyptian campaign, 282, 283, 285 ff.; retires from Egypt, 287; interview with Popilius Lænas, 290; claim to be a god, 299, 300, 312; love for women, 302; death of, 312.
 Antiochus Eupator, 308.
 Antiochus I. Soter, 249.
 Antiochus the Great, 259-61, 263, 266-72.
 Antiochus Theos, 246; his wives Berenice and Laodice, 250, 251.
 Apocalypse of Baruch, 87.
 Apollonius, 297.
 Apostasy and its punishment, 181.
 Aramaic, Daniel and Ezra partly in, 43, 45; Eastern and Western, 43, 44; original of Daniel probably in, 53.
 Aristeas, Epistle of, 60, 194.
 Artaxerxes, 138.
 Ashdod, battle of, 306.
 Assidæans, 219.
 Assumption of Moses, 90.
 Astyages, 127.
 Atonement, 197.
 Baba Bathra, 52.
 Bagoses, 57.
 Baruch, *Apocalypse of*, 87; literature, 85; references to Daniel, 87; the prophet, 110.
 Battles: Adasa, 308; Ashdod, 306; Beth-horon, 297, 306, 308; Bethsura, 297, 306; Eleasa, 308; Emmaus, 267; Magnesia, 272; Pelusium, 282, 285.
 Bear rising up, 152; symbol of Medo-Persia, 150-1.
 Beast, or animal, 148.
 Behistun Inscription, 124.
 Behrmann, 150, 154, 177, 180, 194-195, 209, 227, 242, 258, 282, 291.
 Belshazzar, 125 ff.; banquet of, 131 ff.; may have been a descendant of Nebuchadnezzar, 131 ff.
 Ben Sira, or *Ecclesiasticus*, 75 ff.; first mention of a canon of Scripture, 76; omission of Daniel's name, 76, 77; on angel rulers, 77.

- Berenice, 250-1.
 Berliner, *Onkelos*, 44.
 Berosus, 107, 108, 122.
 Bertholdt, 56, 270, 304.
 Beth-horon, battle of, 297, 306, 308.
 Bethsura, battle of, 297, 306.
 Bevan, Prof. A., 180, 184, 274, 280, 297, 304; admissions of, 184, 220, 222, 225, 226, 252, 253; *Critical Commentary on Daniel*, 55, 120, 154.
 Bevan, E. R., 299, 303, 307, 308, 309; *House of Seleucus*, 246, 258.
 Bickell, 95.
 Birks, Prof. T. R., see *Introduction*.
 Blank in Jewish annals, 56.
 Blass, see *Kautzsch*, 71.
 Bleek, 162.
 Bludau, *Die alex. Uebersetzung*, 61.
 Book sealed, 321.
 Boscawen, 124.
- Calvin, 255.
 Cambyses, 126, 137; and Cyrus, 244-5.
 Camisards, 314.
 Carchemish, 103, 107.
 Charles, Rev. Prof. R. H., *Apoc. of Baruch*, 87; article on "The Messiah of O.T. Prophecy," 95 ff.; *Assumption of Moses*, 90; *Enoch*, 80; *Eschatology*, 92; *Jubilees*, 94.
 Chasidim, 219, 296.
 Cheyne, *Bampton Lectures*, 94, 95, 155.
 Chigi MS. of Sept. Vers. of Daniel, 62; Dr Salmon on, 63.
 Choaspes, 172.
 Christ spoken of as "banned," or devoted to death, 203; as "the holy thing," holy temple, 201-3.
 Clay, 140.
 Clement of Alexandria, 119.
 Clement of Rome, 85, 100.
 Cleopatra, 280.
 Commandment, going forth of, 207, 229 ff.
 Contemptible person, 277-9.
 Contract tablets, 126.
 Cornill, 220.
 Covenant with many, 234-5.
- Cyrus, 126-31, 134-9, 141, 172-174; and Cambyses, 244-5; *Cylinder*, 179; see under *Tablets and Jew's*, 131.
- Daily sacrifice, see *Perpetual*, 179, 186.
 Dalman, *Gram. Aram.*, 44.
 Daniel, Book of, and the Revelation, 156-7; importance of, 63; in Hagiographa, 50; not Maccabean, 164, 170; probably a book of extracts from a larger work, 46, 50, 53; Septuagint translation, 54; written originally in Aramaic, 53.
 Daniel's absence from the setting up of the image, 116; intercession, 191, 194.
 Darius the Mede, 134 ff.; a vassal king, 135-6; regarded as a Divine incarnation, 140.
 Dedication, Feast of the, 186.
 Delitzsch, Franz, 55; Friedrich, 172.
 Demetrius Soter, 308-9.
 "Desire of women," 301-2.
 Desolator riding on the wing of the abomination of desolation, 227-8, 324.
 De Wette, 56.
 Dillmann, 79, 80.
 Discrepancies of modern scheme, 205.
 Division, threefold, of Old Testament books, 51.
 Dogmatic prepossessions, 192. See *Introduction*.
 Dream, Nebuchadnezzar's, of great image, 140.
 Driver, 118, 120, 124, 126, 128, 137, 187, 234, 312.
 Dura, plain of, 115-6.
- Ebrard, 180.
 Ecclesiasticus, see *Ben Sira*.
 Eichhorn, 210.
 Elam, 172.
 Eleazar, brother of Judas Maccabeus, 297; martyrdom of (2 Macc. vi.), 296.
 Eleasa, battle of, 308.

- Elephants, 311.
 Elliott's *Horæ Apocalyptica*, see *Introduction*.
 Emmaus, battle of, 297.
 Enoch, Book of, 79 ff.; references to Daniel, 81-4.
 Ephraim Syrus, 301.
 Epistle of Aristeas, 60.
 Esdras, fourth Book of, 91; Bensly and James, 92; Gunkel, 92; four kingdoms, 91; vision of eagle, 91.
 Eusebius, 119.
 "Evening morning," 185, 187, 190.
 Evil-Merodach, 122.
 Ewald, 56, 74, 86, 152, 154, 180, 220, 221, 253, 255, 284, 301, 304.
 Ezekiel and Daniel, 48.
 Ezra, Book of, partly in Aramaic, 43.
 Ezra, his work in Judæa, 51, 230.
- Faber, G. S., 182; *Sacred Calendar of Prophecy*, 301, 326.
 Farrar, Dean, 55, 152, 153, 159, 161, 210, 227.
 Fast in days of Jehoiakim, 109.
 Feast of Dedication, 186.
 Field, *Hexapla*, 61.
 First Book of Maccabees, see *Maccabees*.
 Forgiveness of sins, 197.
 Fortresses, god of, 302.
 Fourth kingdom, Roman, 164 ff.; two distinct phases of, 157-8.
 Frankenberg, *Datierung der Psalmen Salomos*, 90.
 Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyhistor*, 70.
 Friedlieb, *Sibyllines*, 70, 72.
 Fritzsche, *Lib. Apoc. V.T.*, 78.
 Fuller, 104.
 Futurist school, see *Introduction*.
- Gesenius, 220, 303.
 Giesebrecht, 216.
 "Glorious land," 180.
 Gobryas, 129, 135, 136.
 God, exalted above every, 298; manifest in flesh, 299; men claiming to be, 299, 300.
 "Gods of his fathers" (Antiochus Epiphanes), 300.
- Grätz, 291, 292, 296.
 Great image, Nebuchadnezzar's dream of, 140.
 Great Synagogue, 51, 52.
 Greek empire, its unity till murder of Roxana and her son Alexander, 177; its fourfold character afterwards, 177.
Greek Inscriptions, Hicks' *Manual* of, 255-6.
 Green, Rev. Prof. W. H., *General Introduction*, 124, 128.
 Grotius, 44.
 Guburu or Gobryas, 129, 135, 136.
 v. Gutschmid, 119.
- Hävernick, 186, 202, 214, 220, 267, 282, 283, 285.
 Hahn, H. A., 62.
 Harnack, 74.
 Hecataeus, 194.
 He-goat and ram, 172.
 Heliodorus, 274-6.
 Heliopolis, 263.
 Hengstenberg, 50, 64, 65.
 Hermas on name *Thegri* or *Segri*, 100.
 Herodotus, 123.
 Hezekiah, men of, 53.
 Hicks, *Manual of Greek Inscriptions*, 255-6.
 High priest sometimes called "the anointed priest," 208.
 Hippolytus, 100, 167, 279.
 Historical discrepancies in ch. xi., 253, 257, 269, 282; see *Omissions*.
 Hitzig, 50, 56, 110, 199, 210, 251, 254, 255, 270, 303.
 Hofmann, J. C. K., 140, 152, 291.
 Holy of Holies, 199, 200; may refer to *persons*, 200, 229; occurs forty-two times in Scripture, 200; profaned, 292; second desecration of, 293.
 "Holy thing," Christ spoken of as, holy temple, 201, 202, 203; as "banned" and devoted to death, 203.
 "Horn, little," of ch. vii., see "*Little horn*."
 "Horn, the very little," of ch. viii., 160; exalted itself against

- the prince of the host, 181; its strange actions, 178; not a new horn, 178.
- Host, 180, 181.
- Hyrcanus, John, 65, 66, 92, 264-5.
- Ignatius, references to Daniel, 100.
- Instructors in religion, 295.
- Intermarriages, 165.
- Ipsus, battle of, 176.
- Isaiah, quoted by Daniel, 281.
- Israelites prophets of Jehovah, 189.
- Jahn, Prof. G., of Königsberg, 45, 55, 61; *Esther, Daniel*, 62, 139; see *Septuagint*.
- Jason, 288-9.
- Jeremiah, seventy years of, 195-6, see under *Seventy*.
- Jerome, 173, 174, 187, 224, 263, 266; 274, 279, 280, 283, 293.
- Jerusalem, sieges of, by Nebuchadnezzar, 101 ff.
- Jewish annals, blank in, 56.
- Jewish canon endorsed by our Lord, 51.
- Jews and Cyrus, 131.
- Joel, Dr M., 60.
- Joseph, farmer of taxes, 264.
- Josephus, 70, 257, 264, 288; references to Daniel, 89, 171.
- Jubilees, Book of, 92, 94; references to Daniel, 92, 93.
- Judgment of the nations, 169.
- Judas Maccabeus, 202, 297, 306-8.
- Judith, Book of, 85.
- Jupiter and Temple, 293-4, 299.
- Jurieu, 314.
- Justin, 162.
- Kabisch, *Das vierte Buch Ezra*, 91.
- Kamphausen, 225.
- Kautzsch, *Apokryphen u. Pseud-epigraphen*, 71, 78, 92; also *Introduction*.
- Keil, 109, 305, 306.
- Kingdom, fourth, see *Fourth kingdom*.
- Kingdoms, four, 56, 91.
- King of fierce countenance, 182.
- Kings, Persian, 244; ten, see *Ten kings*.
- Kittim, ships of, 291.
- Klein, G., 85.
- Kliefoth, 109, 306.
- Kneucker, *Baruch*, 86.
- Knobel, *Proph. der Hebräer*, 54.
- Köhler, 225; see *Introduction*.
- Koheleth, 50.
- König, F. E., *Einleitung*, see *Introduction*.
- Kranichfeld, 175, 241, 245, 268, 313.
- Kuenen, 51.
- Labynetus, 123.
- Languages in Daniel, 43, 45.
- Laodice, 250.
- Law destroyed, 295.
- Lee, Prof. S., 302.
- Lengerke, von, 118, 251, 255, 270.
- Lenormant, 161.
- Lion and eagle, 148; symbol of, 148; winged, 149.
- Lions, dens of, 140.
- "Little horn" of ch. vii., 155-60; not a future Antichrist, 166-7; not identical with "the very little horn" of ch. viii., 163 ff.
- Littmann, 92.
- Livy, 277, 278, 284.
- Luca, Marianus de, 167, 168.
- Luciferians, 238.
- LXX., see *Septuagint, Jahn*, 45.
- Maccabees, got little from heathen king, 309.
- Maccabees, first Book of: allusion to miracles, 63, 64; omission of Divine name, 67; quotes from LXX. version, 64, 65; Sadducean in tone, 66; its date, 66; written in Hebrew, 68; third Book of, 64; fourth Book of, 64.
- Maccabeus, Judas, see *Judas*; Simon, 95-97.
- Magnesia, battle of, 272.
- Mahaffy, J. P., *Empire of Ptolemies*, 255, 264.
- Margoliouth, Prof. D. S., 77; shows reference to Daniel in *Sirach* xlix. 9, 77.

- Masechet Sopherim*, Dr J. Müller, 60.
 Mashal, or parable, 113, 117, 121.
 Maspero, 126.
 Massoretic punctuation, 198, 206 ;
 emphatic punctuation, 206-7, 226,
 247-8, 269.
 Mattathias, 217, 296-7.
 Maurer, 270.
 Mede, Joseph, 162, 314 ; see *Intro-
 duction*.
 Median empire, an independent
 empire, not spoken of by Daniel,
 134.
 Megasthenes, 119, 120.
 Meinhold, 227, 258.
 Melchizedek, priesthood of, 94.
 Menelaus, 265, 282-3, 288-9, 291-2.
 Meni, Meni, Tekel, u-Pharsin, 133.
 Merx, 44.
 Messiah, days of, 189-90, 319 ; cut
 off, 223 ; and had nothing, 224 ;
 to make a covenant with many,
 234-5.
 Messianic interpretation, 196.
 Metals in great image, 145.
 Meyer, Eduard, 128.
 Midrash Rabba, 117.
 Miracles in general, 113.
 Miracles in Daniel referred to by
 Ignatius, 100 ; in I Maccabees,
 64 ; in Clem. Rom., 100 ; in
 Hebrews xi., 97.
 Miracles in Daniel's days, 114.
 Miraculous accounts supposed to
 disprove authorship, 54.
 Mohammedanism, 182.
 Moore, G. F. 180.
 Müller, Dr Joel, 60.
- Nabûna'id, 123 ff.
 Nanaia, the goddess, 301.
 Nations, judgment of, 169.
 Nebuchadnezzar : dream of great
 image, 140 ff. ; madness of, 118
 ff. ; madness not mentioned in
 any Babylonian inscriptions yet
 discovered, 120 ; sieges of Jeru-
 salem, 101 ff.
 Nehemiah, * 231 ; and Daniel's
 prayer, 49.
 Neriglissor, 123.
 Nestlé on "abomination of desola-
 tion," 294.
- New Testament, passages of Daniel
 quoted, 97-100. Add also to
 these : Acts i. 7 ; I Thess. v. 1 ;
 Apoc. xvii. 12, xviii. 17 (iv. 16) ;
 Dan. ii. 8 in Eph. v. 16,
 Col. iv. 5 ; Dan. ii. 13 in Luke
 ii. 1 ; also New Testament
 phrase *σημεία καὶ τέρατα*.
 Newton, Sir Isaac, see *Introduction*.
 Nicanor, 186-7, 308.
 Niese, *Kritik der beiden Makka-
 bäer*, 308.
 Nitocris, Queen, 123-4, 133.
- Omissions in ch. xi., peculiar, 249,
 252, 261, 290, 293, 297-8.
 Onias II., 264 ; III., 183, 210, 215,
 224, 226, 265, 282-3, 288-9 ; IV.,
 263.
 Oppressor and taskmaster, 273.
 Origen's *Hexapla*, 61.
 Our Lord's endorsement of Jewish
 Canon, 51.
- Papacy predicted, the, 168.
 Papias, 88.
 Peiser, 126.
 Pelusium, battle of, 282, 285.
 Pember, G. H., 238.
 Perpetual service, the, 178, 180.
 Persian kings, 244.
 Peshitta, or Peshitto, Syriac ver-
 sion, 144 ; see *Syriac*.
 Pharaoh Necho's war with Josiah,
 105-6.
 Pharisaic party, opinion of Macca-
 bees, 82.
 Physcon, 285-7, 290.
 Pinches, Dr T. G., 122, 125, 129,
 136, 137.
 Polybius, 284.
 Polyhistor, 70.
 Popilius Lænas, 290.
 Porphyry, 55, 153, 161, 164, 275,
 279, 310, 313, 314.
Prince of covenant, or *allied prince*,
 282.
 Prodigal Son, parable of, 121.
 Psalms of Pharisees, 90.
 Psalter of Solomon, 90.
 Ptolemy I. (Soter), 247-9 ; II.
 (Philadelphus), 250-2 ; III.

- (Euergetes), 253-7; IV. (Philopater), 259-61; V. (Epiphanes), 261-2, 267, 270 ff., 280; VI (Philometor), 280, 283, 285, 290.
- Pusey, 48, 50, 62, 64, 65, 118, 144, 148, 151, 152, 153, 165, 183, 186, 280; see *Introduction*.
- Ram and he-goat, 172.
- Rawlinson, Sir H., 123; Canon, 124.
- Repeopling of city before rebuilding, 220-1.
- Revelation, Book of, and Daniel, 99-100, 156-7.
- Ribs, the three, belonged to one animal, 151.
- Righteousness, 198.
- Robertson Smith, 51, 241.
- Rome, Church of, and its claims to have Divine right to persecute, 167; embassies to, 286-7, 290.
- Rosenmüller, 173, 270.
- Royal banquet, two kings at one table, 286.
- Running to and fro, 321.
- Rupprecht, see *Introduction*.
- Ryle, Bishop H. E., 50, 170.
- Ryssel, 78.
- Sacrifice, the end of, 202.
- Salmon, Dr, on Chigi MS., 63.
- Sanctuary, cleansing of (see *Temple*), 297, 324.
- Schiel, 124.
- Schiller, 169.
- Schlatter, 264, 265.
- Schrader, 119, 122, 123, 126.
- Schürer, *Gesch. des jüd. Volkes*, 69, 70.
- Scopas, 266.
- Scriptures, destruction of, 53.
- Sea, the Great, 147.
- Sealing of Christ, 199; vision and prophet, 199, 229.
- Sealed book, 321.
- Seleucus I. (Nicator), 248, 249, 257; II. (Callinicus), 250-1, 255-8; III., 257; IV. (Philopater) and his reign, 273-7; oppressor and taskmaster, 273.
- Seleucidian era, 214.
- Septuagint: alteration of numbers in Dan. ix., 214; strove to connect Dan. ix. with 1 Macc., 218; importance of, 63; meaning of word, 59, 60; revision of ix. 25, 213; translation of Daniel, 58, 59; translation of Pentateuch, 59; treatment of text, 216-7; when made, 59.
- Seventy Weeks: connection with Seventy Years, 192, 203-4, 215; beginning of, 209 ff., 211; cannot refer to Maccabean age, 196, 203, 204, 215; consist of three periods, 206-7, 222; first seven, 209 ff.; last week, 234 ff.; over four centuries of quiet, 232; sketch of, 232 ff.; a time of grace nearly five centuries allotted to Jewish people, 232 ff.; alterations made in LXX. version, 216, 217.
- Seventy years, 195-6, 204-5, 228.
- Ships of Kittim, 291.
- Sibyllines, third Book of, 68 ff.; references to Daniel, *passim*.
- Sieges of Jerusalem, 101 ff.
- Simon Maccabeus, 95-7.
- Six acts of blessing, 196-8, 229.
- Smith, Robertson, see *Robertson*.
- Sons of Tobias, 264.
- Stars cast down, 178, 180.
- Street and trench, 220.
- Susa, 171, 172.
- Swete, Rev. Prof., *Septuagint*, 60, 63.
- Symbol of lion, 148.
- Symbolical meanings not to be invented, 144.
- Syriac version, Peshitto, notes of interpretation in MSS., 247.
- Syro-Hexaplar version of LXX., 62.
- Tablet of Cyrus, error in, 128-9.
- Tacitus, 64.
- Tammuz, or Adonis, 301.
- Targum, ch. xi. appears to be a, 251; proof of the prophecy of ch. xi. in its present shape being such, 311-3, 315, 381; of Palestine, 315; expanded text, 247, 251, 253, 261, 268, 274, 278, 281, 284, 314-5, 318-9.

- Temple : four decrees concerning rebuilding of, 229-31 ; plunder of, 274, 292, 293 ; profanation of, 293, 294 ; purification of, 213, 307 ; rebuilding of, 229 ; see *Sanctuary*.
 Ten kings, as explained by modern scholars, 161
 Ten, number indicative of plurality, 158-9.
 Third ruler in kingdom, 133.
 Thirty days, 325.
 Thirty years' oppression, 308.
 Three, indicative of plurality, 151, 159.
 Threefold division of Old Testament books, 51.
 Time, times, and a half, 187, 321 ; two portions of same duration, 323.
 Tischendorf, 62.
 Tobias, sons of, 264 ff.
 Tobit, Book of, 85.
 Todd, J. H., see *Introduction*.
 Trouble, time of, 319-20.
 Two legs : the number in the two legs not significant, 146.
 Two thousand three hundred, 186.

 Ulai, 172.
 Urquhart, Rev. J., see *Introduction*.

 "Very little horn," the, of ch. vii., 160.
- Vespasian, 239.
 Vischer, *Offenbarung Johannis*, 73.
 Visions ought to be explained independently, 146.

 Watchers, or wakeful ones, 80, 84.
 Wellhausen and Jahn, 62.
 Wescher, 255.
 Wette, de, 56.
 Wickes, Dr, on *Accents*, 207.
 "Wilful king," the, 298.
 Winckler, 55, 122, 123, 125, 126, 129, 137, 138, 139, 141.
 Winer, 220.
 Winged lion, 149.
 Wisdom, Book of, 50.
 "Without hand," 182-3.
 Wright, C. H. H., *Bampton Lectures on Zechariah*, 49, 190, 233, 308, 317 ; *Koheleth*, 51, 52, 60, 64 ; *Biblical Essays*, 324.
 Wright, Prof. Dr W., 79.

 Xenophon, *Cyropædia*, 135-6.
 Xerxes, 245.

 Zechariah and the Book of Daniel, 49-56, 189 ; four empires, the, 56 ; war-chariots, the, 49 ; see *Index of Texts* and *Introduction*.

TEXTS SPECIALLY EXPLAINED

(Passages of Daniel are, for obvious reasons, for the most part omitted.)

Genesis	i. 5	190	Zechariah	x.	56
	i. 6	41		xi.	56, 320
Leviticus	xxvi. 34, 35	192, 194		xi. 6, 15, 17	320
2 Kings	xxv. 28	132		xiv. 6, 7	190
2 Chron.	xxxvi. 20, 21	192		"month" of	325
Psalms	xviii. 10	228	Matthew	xxiv. 15	240
	lvii. 4	115	Luke	i. 33	201
	cx.	94, 97		xxiv. 44	51
Proverbs	xxv. 1	53	John	i. 10	224
Isaiah	vii.	301, 316		iii. 33	199
Jeremiah	li. 34	114		vi. 27	199
	li. 44	114	Revelation	xii. 5, 6	324
Ezekiel	xxviii. 2	298			
Daniel	ix. 27	321, 324		<i>Apocrypha</i>	
	xi. 41	83	1 Maccabees	i. 16-19	285
	xii. 13	79		i. 56, 57	53
Zechariah	i. 8	145		ii. 27	218
	ii. 1-4	56, 221		iii. 6	305
	iii. 8-10	316	2 Maccabees	iii.	274
	iii. 9	198		vi.	93, 296
	vi. 1-3	49, 56		xi. 16-36	307
	vi. 12-13	190, 246	Sirach	xvii. 14	77
	vi.	95		xlx.	76 ff.
	ix. 8	274		xlx. 9	69
	ix. 13, 14	56, 317			

WORKS BY REV. CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D.

- The Book of Genesis in Hebrew, with a critically revised Text.** Various Readings, and Grammatical and Critical Notes. London and Edinburgh: Williams & Norgate. 1859. Price 5s.
- The Book of Ruth in Hebrew, with a critically revised Text.** Various Readings, including a new collation of twenty-eight Hebrew MSS. (most of them not previously collated), and a Grammatical and Critical Commentary, to which is appended the Chaldee Targum, with various Readings, and a Chaldee Glossary. London: Williams & Norgate. 1864. Price 7s. 6d.
- Zechariah and his Prophecies considered in relation to Modern Criticism.** With a Grammatical and Critical Commentary, and New Translation. (The Bampton Lectures for 1878.) London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1879. Second Edition. Price 14s.
- The Book of Koheleth, commonly called Ecclesiastes, considered in relation to Modern Criticism and to the Doctrines of Modern Pessimism, with a Critical and Grammatical Commentary and a Revised Translation.** (The Donnellan Lectures for 1880-81.) London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1883. Price 12s.
- Biblical Essays: or Exegetical Studies on the Books of Job and Jonah, Ezekiel's Prophecy of Gog and Magog, St Peter's "Spirits in Prison," and the Key to the Apocalypse.** Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1886. Price 5s.
- The Writings of St Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland.** A Revised Translation, with Introduction and Notes, Critical and Historical. London: The Religious Tract Society. Third Edition, 1897, considerably enlarged, and with Irish Texts. Pp. 160. Price 2s.
- An Introduction to the Old Testament.** Sixth Edition. With a Bibliographical Appendix brought down to 1898. *Ninth Thousand.* London: Hodder & Stoughton, 27 Paternoster Row. 1905.
- The Bible Readers' Manual: or Aids to Biblical Study, for Students of the Holy Scriptures.** Edited by the Rev. C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D. London and Glasgow: William Collins, Sons, & Co. 1894. (Various sizes and prices.) Profusely illustrated.
- Roman Catholicism: or the Doctrines of the Church of Rome** briefly examined in the Light of Scripture. Price 1s. With illustrations and a facsimile of a Tetzal Indulgence. 1900. Third Edition, revised. The Religious Tract Society.
- The Service of the Mass in the Greek and Roman Churches.** With Illustrations. Price, cloth, 1s.; sewed, 8d. Religious Tract Society. 1898.
- The Intermediate State and Prayers for the Dead.** Examined in the Light of Scripture, and of Ancient Jewish and Christian Literature. London: Francis Griffiths. 1900. Price 5s. net.
- Protestant Dictionary, containing Articles on the History, Doctrines, and Practices of the Christian Church.** Edited by Rev. CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., and the Rev. CHARLES NEIL, M.A. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1904.
- Isalah and other Historical Studies.** London: Francis Griffiths, 34 Maiden Lane, Strand. 1905. Crown 8vo. Price 6s. net.
- The Suffering Servant of Jehovah** depicted in Isaiah lii. and liii. Considered in relation to Criticism Past and Present. London: Francis Griffiths. 1905. Crown 8vo. Price 6d. net.
- Daniel and his Prophecies.** London: Williams & Norgate. 1906. Price 7s. 6d.
- Critical and Grammatical Commentary on the Book of Daniel,** being a Supplement to the foregoing. 1906. Williams & Norgate. Price 7s. 6d. net.